

Suppose I had failed? Well, I think it would still have been the correct move. Sooner or later I would have found my right path in life and it is only by daring to fail that one builds the courage and ability to succeed later on.

If you give to your work—whatever it may be—every bit of your enthusiasm, talent, energy, and determination you will find an inner strength and security that can never be taken away from you. You will also find something you can enjoy now and every day of your life, instead of waiting for some far-off future.

That is why my advice to young people is: "Don't dream about security—make it for yourself, out of yourself. Dare to believe in yourself—and act accordingly. If you do, both your present and your future are secure."

### Significant Goal of St. Mary's

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. GEORGE P. MILLER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 14, 1963

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, my alma mater, St. Mary's College, in California is celebrating its centennial year. This school has traditionally focused on the liberal arts and this is reflected in its centennial year theme, which is "The Liberal Arts: Language of Free Men."

The achievements of this great educational institution in meeting the challenges of our times through its liberal arts curriculum, has been highlighted in an editorial in the Morning News of San Leandro, Calif.

I am pleased to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following most significant editorial:

#### SIGNIFICANT GOAL OF ST. MARY'S

In Moraga Valley, among the rolling foothills of Contra Costa County, lies St. Mary's College, which this year is celebrating its centennial.

It is a small college when compared to our great State universities. But it has issued a call to all thoughtful men on the occasion of its hundredth birthday and is attracting national and international attention through its curriculum in the liberal arts.

The college has chosen as its centennial theme: "The Liberal Arts: Language of Free Men."

St. Mary's College includes, as part of the required curriculum, world classics seminars which consist in the close reading and free discussion of the original writings of the world's greatest thinkers. In addition, St. Mary's is helping to set the pace in the United States by being one of the few colleges that has an experimental integrated liberal arts curriculum in the classic tradition, teaching select students to discover from original sources the relationship between all fields of knowledge as well as fulfill a major in a specific discipline.

St. Mary's College is building a bridge of understanding between science and the humanities. Its graduates become leaders better able to communicate with all groups of a society in danger of becoming so specialized that the learned in one field are incapable of understanding those of another.

This particular college and others devoted to the liberal disciplines are important to us all in the struggle for understanding and brotherhood.

Science studied in isolation can and does flourish in dictatorships, in totalitarian regimes. But liberal arts—never. Totalitarianism depends upon narrow education. A liberal arts curriculum helps achieve an appreciation of the most important and abiding values of Western civilization.

If only a few institutions of higher learning develop their own curricula along similar lines, the impact upon America's future and the future of civilized man will be significant.

### Powell, the Official Favorite

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Congress, as a body, has been under continual criticism in the press, partly motivated by the abdication of congressional powers to the executive branch and the other motivation being the official and unofficial activities of individual Members.

There has been much written and discussed about the policies and behavior of the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor. In a prepared statement the other day, the gentleman from New York attempted to rebut the charges leveled against him in the other body by the Senator from Delaware, and in addition, he attempted to answer all of his critics by accusing them of racial prejudice.

Obviously, this personal whitewash attempt is difficult to reconcile with the official records. The political factors revolving around the gentleman from New York and his prestige have been thoroughly discussed throughout the country. The Congress has an obligation to provide its effectiveness and one of the ways that this can be accomplished is by proper behavior on the part of all of its Members.

The entire subject matter to which I refer has been effectively discussed in the news media, and a brief, concise, and clear presentation appeared in the Chicago Daily News of February 7, which I ask leave to insert into the Record at this point:

#### POWELL, THE OFFICIAL FAVORITE

Except at election time, Congressmen generally band together for the protection of the system and their perquisites under it. It is rare indeed, therefore, that one attacks another with the outraged fury that Senator WILLIAMS, Republican, of Delaware, turned on Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL, Democrat, of New York.

It is almost as rare that such a deservedly fiery denunciation of a Congressman also becomes an indictment of the administration. As a Negro leader, POWELL enjoys enormous political power, and he exploits it shamelessly.

His foreign junkets at taxpayers' expense have been well publicized, but Senator WILLIAMS produced new evidence even more scandalous, since they involve administrative favors. He noted, for instance, that the IRS continues to carry POWELL on its books as a delinquent in taxes, including fraud penalties, for 1949 through 1955, although

he has been continuously employed in Congress at a handsome salary.

WILLIAMS said the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare placed at the disposal of POWELL \$250,000 from funds appropriated to fight juvenile delinquency. In view of POWELL's record, this displays an astonishing confidence that he would make nonpolitical use of the money. At rates as low as 3.13 percent, POWELL and associates obtained Government loans to finance a housing development and to purchase hotels.

It is well that the public should be aware of these matters. WILLIAMS is too optimistic however, if he hopes to bring about the defeat of POWELL. This is not the first disclosure of his practices, but his continued popularity suggests that his constituents react with approval and envy, rather than resentment. We would have hoped that the Kennedy administration would take a broader view of the public interest.

### Why Not Get Down to the Facts?

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. FRANK J. BECKER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting herewith an editorial from one of America's finest newspapers, namely, the Tablet published in Brooklyn, N.Y.

This editorial from the issue of February 14 "Why Not Get Down to the Facts?" speaks for itself and is indicative of exactly what I have been talking about for a long time. I am certain if this were done everyone in this country would be much better off.

The editorial follows:

#### WHY NOT GET DOWN TO THE FACTS?

Anyone who has watched Secretary McNamara's televised effort to explain how the Red missile menace was dismantled in Cuba, and viewed and heard the other reports on the defensive—as opposed to offensive—weapons, and learned of the presence of thousands of Red troops in Cuba—must have been confused and bewildered.

How anyone could understand, or come to an optimistic conclusion, after watching the Pentagon drama, we don't know. Most of the aerial reconnaissance photographs taken before and after the missiles were, as alleged, carried home were difficult to understand. Many of the pictures were not clear; they were given far more credit for deciphering objects than the viewer could see. Pictures snapped at low levels were, to be sure, clear and revealing but there were too many close-up views of the missiles in place, and then endeavoring to compare them with an excess of far-away and fuzzy abandoned sites, proved nothing. There would have been some value if the camera used the same missile site, giving a before and after view.

But this is neither here nor there. The undeniable fact is that the Soviet has 17,000 armed men 90 miles from American shores and large quantities of weapons including planes. What is the sense of describing these troops or the weapons as "defensive?" And even if so, what are they defending and against whom?

The precise number of Red troops in Cuba is not all important, neither is the offensive or defensive type of the very large quantity of arms. The point is that Moscow is transforming Cuba into a strong military base, irrespective of whether or not long-range

missile and IL-28 bombers have been hauled away. And it is important as to what the Soviet intends to do with the "defensive" weapons and the well-armed and well-disciplined combat forces on the island. Why are they there and for what purpose? Those are the important questions.

The most un reassuring thing about the whole business is the revelation of how dismally unfinished it is. We had the Soviet on the run, and now it is all too plain that we failed to run them all the way.

There was no apparent need for this failure. The Government was undoubtedly right to focus its attention on getting the known intermediate-range missiles out of Cuba, and the military diplomatic operation to that end was excellent. The partial blockade was accompanied by plain warnings of tougher action if the U.S. terms were not met.

But for that very reason the United States was in a perfect position to carry the exercise to its logical conclusion. It should have told Khrushchev to remove every last one of his soldiers and send in not so much as one more rifle, lest he risk the most serious consequences. Everything about the Soviet reactions in October argues that Khrushchev would have complied; indeed, how could he not have, smack up against the full array of U.S. military power?

Why wasn't it done? We suppose in part because of the same mental attitude which has so often bedeviled the United States in dealing with the Soviets, an attitude that in all fairness has been in evidence before as well as during this administration. It is a fear of pushing the enemy too far, of backing the bear into a corner from which it can escape only by attacking. The idea is always to give the Soviet a partial exit or some means of facesaving.

If that was the reason for not completing the job we must confess it has made our present situation much more difficult. Now our risk is great and we have lost the psychological advantage which we enjoyed last fall.

### Dallas Mortgage Bankers Oppose President Kennedy's Tax Plan

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. BRUCE ALGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in order to keep the Members of Congress informed as to the attitude of important segments of our population concerning the President's tax proposal, I am including as a part of these remarks a resolution passed by the Dallas Mortgage Bankers Association at Dallas, Tex.:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE DALLAS MORTGAGE BANKERS ASSOCIATION ON FEBRUARY 11, 1963

Whereas the President's proposed tax program will provide for tax reduction to the American taxpayer, and

Whereas this program will now further provide for tax reforms which include the following:

1. A taxpayer who itemizes his deductions will be able to deduct these expenses only to the extent that they exceed 5 percent of his adjusted gross income.

2. Taxation of the appreciated value of property at death or when transferred as a gift.

3. Proposal to tax as ordinary income the gain on the sale of real estate held for investment or used in trade or business to the extent of depreciation taken.

Whereas the proposed tax program provides for reductions in base tax rates, the American citizen will lose his encouragement to own his home that results from his right to deduct taxes and interest before computing his income tax (except deductions exceeding 5 percent of his adjusted gross income). Likewise, the good citizen who contributes generously to his church, charitable organizations, and the like would similarly be penalized: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved That the Dallas Mortgage Bankers Association protest these changes to the present tax regulations which would penalize the American homeowners and property owners.

### The Success Story of Tobacco Controls

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, repeatedly during the past 2 years, the administration has pointed to tobacco and cotton as success stories in supply management. Cotton is now in the worst fix in its long history, and a recent report by U.S. Department of Agriculture economists raises considerable doubt as to the success of supply management of tobacco.

The artificial stimulus of Government control has had harmful effects on American tobacco quality, not only since the introduction of the new chemical—MH-30—but in previous years as well. Police-State controls, such as have been commonplace in tobacco for many years, put the emphasis on volume production and as a result, quality suffers.

This is one of the reasons why American tobacco has not kept pace with the rest of the world in capturing its fair portion of world markets.

In tobacco as in other commodities, experience should suggest a return to the discipline of the marketplace as being best for producer and consumer alike.

The following article which appeared in the February 23 issue of the Washington Post is a remarkable commentary on the success story of supply management in tobacco:

SOME ODOR PRODUCED BY TOBACCO PROGRAM  
(By Julius Duschka)

The Government's once highly touted tobacco program is starting to come apart like a roll-your-own cigarette.

Not only has there been an increase in surplus tobacco; Government policies have encouraged the production of poor-quality tobacco.

Per capita consumption of tobacco declined slightly in 1962 in the United States for the first time in 8 years.

The decrease is attributed by Department of Agriculture experts to poor-quality tobacco as much as to increasing concern over the effects of smoking on a person's health.

SUBSIDY PROGRAM BLAMED

These facts are documented in a highly unusual report quietly issued this week by

the Agriculture Department, where for both political and economic reasons tobacco is an extremely touchy subject.

The report was prepared by a committee of seven Agriculture Department economists. They bluntly concluded that Department subsidy programs are largely responsible for the poor-quality tobacco that is flooding the auction markets.

For more than 20 years tobacco production has been carefully controlled under the most rigid restrictions.

Secretary of Agriculture Orville L. Freeman and many Members of Congress have frequently held up the tobacco program as an example of how surplus farm production can be controlled.

But in recent years tobacco farmers have been increasing their per-acre production to try to make more money in the face of rising costs.

More than 500,000 farms grow tobacco on tiny plots of only a few acres in 16 States. The principal tobacco States are North Carolina, Kentucky, South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, and Connecticut.

The biggest tobacco State is North Carolina, which gets 70 percent of its cash from income from tobacco.

The chairman of the House Agriculture Committee, HAROLD D. COOLEY, is from North Carolina, and the Agriculture Department generally is exceedingly careful in what it says about the tobacco program to avoid antagonizing COOLEY.

To circumvent the acreage restrictions on tobacco, farmers have been planting their crops closer and pouring fertilizer on their land to get a greater yield from each acre.

In addition, farmers have been using a new chemical, maleic hydrazide, or MH-30, to inhibit the growth of suckers or unwanted sprouts on tobacco plants.

#### QUALITY IS AFFECTED

Before the chemical came into wide use farmers had to pinch off the sprouts. That is a slow, laborious and backbreaking job. It takes 32 hours to do this on a single acre of tobacco.

But, the Agriculture Department economists noted in their report, the chemical adversely affects the quality of the tobacco.

A spokesman for a major tobacco company said at a recent Agriculture Department hearing that "we . . . would not knowingly or willingly consider marketing a new cigarette which had a consumer acceptance level as low as that indicated for cigarettes made from a tobacco treated with maleic hydrazide."

### Hospital Care for Gold Star Mothers

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 5, 1963

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which would authorize hospital care for Gold Star Mothers at Veterans' Administration hospitals. It is my feeling that it is our Government's obligation to care for those who have suffered in battle, and also for their dependents and survivors which they have left behind.

These brave mothers raised sons and daughters to be good citizens and to give their lives, if necessary, to defend this great country of ours. We ought to do

1963

A907

gative of Congress in the school desegregation decision.

Thus, George Washington counseled an infant nation—a nation which he helped to establish, a nation which he led as its first President for two terms. He was a man of true greatness. His first thought was always of his duty to his country. This principle motivated him to become the great commander in chief of the Continental Army—to reluctantly assume the Office of President and to decline a third term in this high office. His greatness lay in his selfless adherence to that which he knew to be right.

Let us apply some of these principles to the Cuban situation. We all know that this is one of the more critical and crucial problems of our time.

We all welcomed the announcement that the Soviets would withdraw several thousand troops from Cuba. This is only as a limited step in the right direction. Neither this withdrawal nor any other partial withdrawal should be considered as a final solution of the basic Cuban problem and threat.

The basic problem, and the real threat to the Americas, lies in the fact that international communism now has a firm foothold in the Western Hemisphere. The "Made in Moscow" government is in Cuba for the primary purpose of increasing and spreading communism's influence and power in Latin America. We know that it is here to stay—if we permit it to do so.

Public debate during the past few weeks has focused largely on whether Khrushchev has or has not withdrawn his offensive weapons from Cuba. Certainly, this is important. None of us can afford to be unconcerned about the threat of missiles and planes which can rain nuclear death and destruction on us in a matter of minutes. However, we must not allow our attention to be preoccupied entirely by an overly meticulous concern about whether the military threat to us has been increased or decreased fractionally by the introduction or withdrawal of certain types or numbers of weapons. If we do we may very well fail to face up to the proposition that, regardless of how many or how few troops support it, the alien and antidemocratic government now being maintained in Cuba by Russian armed soldiers is in and of itself the real and basic threat to the peace and security of the American Republics. International communism at our very doorstep, without regard to the supporting weaponry, is offensive to me, and, I believe, to a majority of my fellow Americans.

I am not primarily concerned over the exact number of troops Khrushchev has in Cuba. Even ten would be too many. I believe that it is the fact that the Russian Bear now stands astride the unhappy island of Cuba which most troubles the average American. The American people are disturbed and uneasy because they know that we cannot live with this menace indefinitely.

Therefore, they want to be assured that our responsible officials recognize the problem and recognize also that it will not just disappear with the passage of time. They want to be convinced that we have the national will and purpose to do everything within our power to wipe out all Soviet-dominated governments in this hemisphere and that we have a firm and hard plan and policy to accomplish this.

In short, I believe that our people take the same position which the Congress itself took when it adopted Senate Joint Resolution 230 last October 3. In adopting this resolution we in Congress expressly reaffirmed the Monroe Doctrine and declared that we were "determined to prevent by whatever means necessary, including the use of arms, the Marxist-Leninist regime in Cuba from extending, by force or the threat of force, its

aggressive or subversive activities to any part of this hemisphere." The resolution declared we were "determined to prevent in Cuba the creation or use of any externally supported military capability endangering the security of the United States."

The American people ask only, I believe, that we adhere to this resolution and that we demonstrate once again that the historic Monroe Doctrine is still an integral part of our national policy and that we do, in fact, consider any attempt by foreign powers "to extend their system to any part of this hemisphere as dangerous to our peace and security."

When these things are done—and when our people are convinced that our Nation is still strong, resolute, vigorous, determined, and above all, unafraid—I know that the patriotic people of this Nation will unite four square behind the Government as they have always done in times of national crisis.

The Preparedness Investigating Subcommittee, in the real course of its inquiry, will develop all of the facts and I hope that it can make a real and tangible contribution in shaping a hard and firm policy which will finally rid the Americas of this cancerous communistic growth.

This is no time for despair. Fear has no place in our thinking. We have every reason to face the future with faith in our form of government and in our ability to make it work. Endowed as we are with individual liberty and our national resources, with faith in a Higher Power and a determination to do our part, we shall meet and conquer the problems of our time. May God sustain us as we go.

#### Senator Williams Lauds Year 2000 Plan

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. CARLTON R. SICKLES

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. SICKLES. Mr. Speaker, a notable effort to educate the voters regarding the issues is being undertaken by the League of Women Voters in the Washington metropolitan area. Each month seven local leagues cooperate to produce the television series "Up for Decision" dealing with governmental problems of interest to the area. In a recent program Senator HARRISON WILLIAMS of New Jersey, gave his views on the year 2000 plan for this area.

League panelists on the program dealing with regional planning were Mrs. Robert T. Andrews, Fairfax County, Va.; Mrs. Geoffrey J. Lanning, Arlington County, Va.; Mrs. Richard T. Atkinson, District of Columbia; and Mrs. William J. Shickler, Prince Georges County. Mrs. Irwin C. Hannum, of Prince Georges County, was moderator. Mrs. R. C. Barrett, of Montgomery County, is the general chairman; the producer for this program was Mrs. Robert Wolf, of Prince Georges County, assisted by Mrs. Robert T. Curtis, of Falls Church, Va.

I am pleased to insert a Washington Post article, of January 24, 1963, dealing with this program in the RECORD:

SENATOR WILLIAMS LAUDS YEAR 2000 PLAN

The year 2000 plan for metropolitan Washington has gained a supporter in the U.S. Senate.

Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr., Demo-

crat, of New Jersey, hailed the proposal as "the kind of foresighted thinking we will want in this area in the years to come."

But he said it was unrealistic to expect the creation of some "superagency" to carry out the program.

"Local governing units are very conservative in changing their nature and pooling their governmental jurisdiction. I feel what we'll have to do is just take existing governmental units and try to find ways to relate them," he said.

The year 2000 plan calls for growth of the area along transportation corridors radiating out from Washington, with wedges of open space separating them. The plan is endorsed by most area planners, Government leaders, and President Kennedy.

WILLIAMS said revitalization of downtown Washington can take place "if there is effective, efficient, reliable—perhaps even comfortable—mass transportation serving the suburbs and feeding the central city."

"The Federal Government can induce local communities to work together on common problems by making money and planning assistance available," he said.

The Senator, who has introduced legislation that would provide mass transportation grants to urban areas, spoke on WETA-TV's "Up for Decision."

#### Promotion of Former Gov. Sid McMath, of Arkansas, to the Rank of Brigadier General in the Marine Corps Reserve

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

#### HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, recently the Commandant of the Marine Corps, Gen. David M. Shoup, notified the former Governor of Arkansas, the Honorable Sidney E. McMath, that he had been selected for promotion to brigadier general in the Marine Corps Reserve.

General McMath is now the third general in the Marine Corps Reserve, and this is in itself a testimony to the great distinction of this fine officer and public official.

In the Arkansas Gazette of February 7 there is a fine editorial entitled "General McMath."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Arkansas Gazette, Feb. 7, 1963.]

#### GENERAL MCMATH

The Marine Corps has been as important as politics in the life of former Governor Sid McMath, and his promotion to the rank of brigadier general in the Marine Reserve must bring a great deal of pleasure to him, as it does to us.

Mr. McMath has been a good citizen of Arkansas as a civilian, in the years since he has been out of public office as well as during the time he served as Governor. When issues have arisen in the public sphere, Mr. McMath has been there to help fight them out, scarcely mindful of the



wounds and scars that political life has inflicted upon him.

Only Marines can judge such things, we suppose, but we would guess that Sid McMath is as formidable a Marine officer as he is a political leader. His decorations, his war record, and the rank he is now being accorded, suggest that Mr. McMath very well exemplifies the ideal of the tough, resourceful, and talented "leatherneck."

### Cuban Aid Project

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

**HON. THOMAS G. ABERNETHY**

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, much has been said of late in criticism of the decision of the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization to proceed with an agricultural aid project for the Soviet Union's Cuban satellite. The project should have been criticized. I hope it will not stop until Director Paul Hoffman and other administrators of this fund withdraw the commitment. If the commitment is not withdrawn, then the United States should withdraw all of its contributions to and support of the United Nations.

On this subject I include as a part of my remarks the comment of Mr. Thurman Sensing, executive vice president of the Southern States Industrial Council, as follows:

#### CUBAN AID PROJECT

The U.N.-firsters will have a difficult time ahead. The first week of February brought out the fact that the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), to which the United States is the largest financial contributor, had published a booklet denouncing "colonialist oppression" by Western countries and describing Soviet Russia as "a brotherhood of free and equal peoples."

No sooner had this outrageous piece of pro-Soviet propaganda been released by UNESCO than it was learned that the U.N. Special Fund will proceed with a \$3 million agricultural aid project for the Soviet Union's Cuban satellite. The United States, which contributes 40 percent of the Fund's financial resources, rightly protested against this outrage. But this was not sufficient to deter the U.N. Special Fund or its American-born Managing Director, Paul G. Hoffman. It is pure subterfuge for Mr. Hoffman to say this will not involve U.S. dollars. Everyone knows that is not so.

The project involves the establishment of an agricultural experiment station in Havana Province that will be of assistance to Red Cuba's collective farm operation. The U.S. Government very properly takes the stand that this project constitutes aid and comfort for an enemy of freedom, for a regime that cruelly treats its own people and threatens all the free nations of the Americas.

Mr. Hoffman, who holds American citizenship, thus far has paid no respect to the feelings of the United States in this matter. He has been quoted as saying: "The day anyone can pressure me successfully, that day I walk out." What is shocking is that Mr. Hoffman has not felt the obligation to walk out of a U.N. organization that wants to send

U.S. taxpayers' money to a Russian satellite that menaces the United States.

It is not the amount of money that is to go to Fidel Castro. If it were one dollar, it would be too much. What counts is the principle of the thing. And the principle is that the people of the United States should not be asked to contribute a single dime to the bloody Castro dictatorship.

It is especially ironical that the U.N. Special Fund wants to subsidize an agricultural project. Who will be the beneficiaries of foodstuffs grown under the program? Not the Cuban people, certainly, not the Cubans languishing in Castro's dungeons. But there are 17,000 or more Russian soldiers in Cuba, and they are well fed. The Russian conquerors have everything. No doubt the U.N. could help produce more vegetables for the Russian field kitchens.

The U.N. aid project for Cuba may be the straw that breaks the camel's back. Only weeks ago, millions of Americans were profoundly indignant that they were in effect subsidizing the U.N.'s war against anti-Communists in Katanga. They could not do anything about that. But the U.N. plan to send money to Cuba is too much for Americans.

Already there is before Congress a resolution that calls for a complete cutoff of U.S. funds to the United Nations if the U.N. Special Fund persists in aiding Fidel Castro and his Russian masters. Such a resolution should enjoy the widest support in the Congress from both parties.

If there is one issue on which all good Americans feel strongly, it is the Cuban issue. It should be clear that the U.S. public will not countenance financial aid to the man and the regime that is our sworn enemy. The American people would not for an instant tolerate direct financial assistance to Fidel Castro. It is certain that if they know what is going on, they will not stand by while the U.N. Special Fund is used as a secret pipeline to provide a Russian satellite in the Caribbean with money furnished by the people of the United States.

Congress, as the source of operating funds for all Government projects, should proceed to issue an ultimatum to the United Nations: "No money for Castro, or else." If the U.N. Special Fund refuses to halt financial aid to a Red dictator, then the United Nations stands exposed as a mere front organization and financial pipeline for the Soviet world conspiracy.

Now is the time for Congress to act, and to repudiate Paul Hoffman at the same time. For Mr. Hoffman, Congress should have one word: "Shame."

### Administration's Farm Program

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

**HON. EDWARD V. LONG**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 25, 1963

Mr. LONG of Missouri. Mr. President, one of the most important matters which will come before the Congress again this year is agriculture legislation. The President has sent Congress his message. It is now our responsibility to enact sound legislation. Two Missouri newspapers, the Springfield Leader-Press and the Daily Dunklin Democrat, recently published thoughtful editorials concerning the President's agriculture program. I ask unanimous consent that these edi-

torials be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Springfield Leader-Press,  
Feb. 1, 1963]

#### IT'S WORTH A TRY

There wasn't a surprise in the whole package of farm program proposals President Kennedy submitted to Congress yesterday.

True, Mr. Kennedy reversed his stand of a year ago by asking for legislation to encourage voluntary rather than mandatory production cutbacks in American agriculture. But that wasn't surprising—the administration indicated some time ago it would probably try this approach.

The two phases of his program that will most affect southwest Missouri are those dealing with dairying and with grains. As for feed grains, the proposals are virtually the same as for the program in effect the past 2 years. There is nothing compulsory about it; a farmer can participate or not, but if he does participate, he is paid for reducing his feed grain acreage.

The fact that this program has worked well, that surpluses have been reduced by it, could be influential in Congress' consideration of the rest of the program which, in the main, employs the same principle.

As for wheat, the President threw the full weight of his office into a plea for farmers to adopt the wheat program to be submitted to growers in a referendum this year. This is the real gambling issue of the whole package.

On its outcome, Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman may be staking his career in the Cabinet—it has been said that defeat may cost his job. And the American Farm Bureau Federation may be gambling more than it reckons against it. Defeat could cost the Farm Bureau considerably in prestige.

But Farm Bureau will not be easily defeated. Not more than two or three other organizations in America spend as much for lobbying, and the Farm Bureau voice has always been strong in Congress.

On the other hand, all the other major farm organizations—National Farmers Union, the Grange and the National Farmers Organization—are working just as hard for the wheat referendum to carry. Most important of all—if the propaganda smoke doesn't hide the facts—farmers will most likely receive no more than \$1 to \$1.25 a bushel for wheat if the referendum is defeated; will get \$2 or more if it carries. The National Association of Wheat Growers and National Federation of Grain Cooperatives also have added their endorsement to the program.

In any case, this could provide a crucial test of how Congress will treat the rest of Mr. Kennedy's program for voluntary controls.

As for dairying, a similar program was proposed. The only compulsion for production cutbacks, if the legislation is enacted, would be that of price. The cooperator, reducing production, would receive substantially more for his milk than would the dairyman who refuses to participate.

This newspaper favored mandatory controls when they were proposed; but they were beaten. Now here is a program that has been demonstrated as workable to a certain extent. The thought of even further deflated farm prices and what they could do to an agricultural area like southwest Missouri is enough to demand our support of the new program.

There is still another angle: President Kennedy feels this program may whack as much as \$200 to \$300 million from the cost

try and make a favorable impression for the executive branch and its programs.

Now I do not stand here and claim for 1 minute that each day President John F. Kennedy now or any other President in the past issues his secret orders for the day's publicity campaign, and that hundreds of mimeograph machines, teletypes and eager messengers then spread the word throughout official Washington and to the far reaches of the executive empire. Far from it.

My point, and it has been made by those much closer to the news business than I am, is that there is this huge propaganda information publicity apparatus in being; I do not think there is argument about that. And it can be and is being used consciously or otherwise to promote the legislative program, economic and political theories, and odd ideas in some cases of the top echelon in the executive branch.

Let me refer to Thomas Jos. Bennett, who spent some time on this matter and devoted his doctoral thesis to the subject of Government publicity. Dr. Bennett wrote just last year in his thesis:

Most of those interviewed agreed that two factors contribute to the de facto uniformity of administration public pronouncements. First of all, although there is little or no coordination of public information officers, there is close consultation among their superiors, at least in the case of the agencies that are properly part of the executive. It makes little difference whether Webster at Agriculture is in touch with Manning at Treasury, if their immediate superiors, from whom they take their orders, and upon whose pleasure their positions depend, meet regularly.

Dr. Bennett put it on the line for us later in his thesis:

It would seem from this that the testimony of the newsmen and the publicists interviewed, which indicated a lack of formal centralization of Federal publicity, was correct in adding that such centralization is unnecessary in view of the localization of issues within a few agencies. It no longer seems unreasonable to speak of the single voice of the Federal Government.

And he winds it up this way:

It must be concluded, therefore, that the publicity operation of the National Government is big enough, active enough, and important enough to warrant concern by the critics.

Let me refer now to the New Leader. In an article in 1960 concerning interservice rivalry, the comment was made in its pages:

What is more, the chief consequence of successfully stifling all public demonstrations of interservice controversy would be the exposure of a single administration view of national security policy. In an area of governmental activity where the executive holds all the trump cards, where the requirements of security classification can be used to bury legitimate opposition within the Government, where there is no pressure group that can make a meaningful impact on the policy process without help from the executive departments, and where such a tremendous part of national resources are being devoted, democratic controls over executive power would become weaker than they are already.

A responsible opposition is necessary in this country, as it is in every country

and under any form of government where the people decide their course, directly or indirectly through their representatives. It is the constitutional duty of Congress as a full partner in the Federal Government to explore and develop the alternatives, to present them to the people, and to cause and encourage full discussion of such matters. When only one side is present, when the alternatives are stifled, when one view is preached from all sides, there is not the choice available for the people. Yet one of the most common expressions in this country is that there are two sides to every story.

There might be little we in Congress can do, no matter what party we belong to or what party controls the administration, to effectively and truly cut back the executive's information-publicity-propaganda staffs and activities.

But certainly we should allow full debate in our own processes, full development of alternatives by the minority, full exposure to the people of the two or even more sides to every story. To do otherwise is an indication that the majority is afraid of the other side, that the minority has right on its side.

And I must remind my colleagues on both sides of the aisle that there are other battles than those between the parties, or between major blocs in the Congress. There is this constant battle, pulling and tugging, between the executive and legislative branches. In this battle all in Congress need to be alert to what is happening to the constitutional rights of this equal partner.

The people are being brainwashed by the Executive's tremendous power of publicity, propaganda, and persuasion to believe that it is time to change the historic proposition that the President proposes and Congress disposes.

How important is this presentation of both sides? It has been called the basis of representative government by a former Senator:

An informed citizenry is the basis of representative government. Democracy—as we know it—cannot exist unless the American people are equipped with the information which is necessary if they are to make the informed political choices on which the proper functioning of the democracy depends. An informed people—able to examine, and when necessary, to criticize, its Government—is the only guarantee of responsible democracy.

So said Senator John F. Kennedy in 1960.

In his new book, "Washington Cover-Up," Clark Mollenhoff assesses the importance of information about Government:

No single factor is more important to the strength of our democracy than the free flow of accurate information about the Government's operation. The citizen in a democracy must know what his Government is doing, or he will lack the soundest basis for judging the candidates and the platforms of our political parties.

A recent issue of the Economic Council Letter was addressed to the problems of Congress in this tug of war with the executive branch. It commented:

As we have said repeatedly, the executive branch of the American Government has been operating, since 1933, at an accelerating rate, above the Constitution and the law. The only power in the Nation which can stand against a militant executive establishment with unlimited resources of men and money, is the Congress.

A great many arguments can be raised against this statement, but they have no validity. When all is said and done, the only political force which can oppose the growth of governmental absolutism is the body directly representing the people not in Government.

It is possible Congress may not be able to stand against the increasing pressure of big government. The answer to that is known to no living man. It is true Congress cannot stand alone. It must have the support of the people. But the people can not come to Washington and tell the bureaucrats what to do. From election to election the voters are dependent on their representatives to speak for them.

We said in our last council letter that the planners (who do control executive policymaking) are making a revolutionary change from limited to unlimited government without our knowledge or consent. Of necessity, the planners are engaged in a war against Congress. But Congress does not yet realize it is engaged in a war with the planners.

It is good for responsible political leaders to avoid factionalism, or anything that smacks of it, as long as possible. But if the planners do not desist from their attacks, someone must come to grips with them. They refuse to settle the issue by open and free debate.

How can a Congress made up of two Houses and nearly 600 Members come to grips with a hierarchical executive branch which operates under a command structure not unlike an army, and supported by a propaganda machine and militant pressure groups equal to those of wartime?

While we fight our legislative battles in these Halls, while our own district interests operate to put us in one group or another at various times, let us remember that we are always engaged in another battle.

We are for better or for worse, in economic sickness and health, wedded to the executive and judicial. But each member in this three-sided marriage must be independent. When the legislative branch fails to exert its independence, it is the people who lose their voice in day-to-day government. The courts remain, but there is no remedy there such as that which the people have in Congress, with its great controls and grants of authority to set policy.

#### BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BECKER] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I, like millions of Americans, have been listening for many years over our news media, in the press and in statements made by Members of Congress, and people in political life, about a bipartisan foreign policy.

The phrase "bipartisan foreign policy" is one of the greatest misnomers that could possibly be used. Everyone knows our foreign policy is strictly and solely

in the hands of the President under the Constitution of the United States.

The term "bipartisan foreign policy" implies in my mind, and I am sure it implies in the minds of many of our citizens, because of letters I have received and questions I have been asked, that the President of the United States when he is discussing the matter of a particular policy in our foreign affairs, would call in not only his own Cabinet members, not only the congressional leaders of his own party, but leaders of the opposition party. And this applies to previous administrations as well as this one.

Now, to my knowledge, the President just does not do this. I have written a report this week which I am going to read, I sent this to all of my weekly newspapers, because of recent letters I have received, in which I have been asked: Were the Republican Members of Congress a party to the foreign policy announced in respect to Cuba, in respect to Canada, in respect to the Skybolt, England, and with respect to our policy insofar as France is concerned?

My report reads as follows:

#### BIPARTISAN FOREIGN POLICY?

I receive many letters in which people ask: "What is meant by bipartisan foreign policy?"

The Cuban fiasco again has pointed up the complete fallacy of what the Kennedy administration likes to put on a sanctimonious pedestal in the guise of "bipartisan foreign policy."

Believe me, there is no such thing.

Certainly, when the President of the United States, who has sole constitutional authority for our foreign policy, makes an irrevocable agreement, even though it may be dangerous, as he did with Castro, all Americans, regardless of politics, back him up.

But, that doesn't mean that his errors are the result of what some of the eggheads like to call bipartisan foreign policy.

What the President does is to make his decisions and then call in the responsible people of both parties and say, in effect: "Well, I've done this. Now, you must be good Americans and go along with me."

This may imply that the opposition sit back and say and do nothing. Well, as an American and as an elected Representative of the people, I never have and never will do that.

The Cuban mess is a good example. So are southeast Asia, Kantanga, etc. The President set a policy; then he told us what he had done and expected us to say amen.

Finally, in October of last year, he did what I and others had recommended—he blockaded Cuba. It should have been done long before that, but anyway he finally did it. So, we pledged our full support to a measure which was overdue, but to which there was no alternative. In the pitifully inadequate measures which followed, we were told nothing—not even the real facts about the Russian buildup in Cuba.

What, then, would have been the result if some of us had swallowed the high-sounding philosophy of "bipartisan foreign policy" and said nothing.

The thousands of Russian troops which are still there would have gone unnoticed. Castro would have gone blithely along, uninterrupted to set up, with Russian help, the Communist base from which to infiltrate all of Latin America, which is his real aim, all the time prepared to protect himself against any U.S. interference because he had missiles which could devastate our cities and the Russian technicians who knew how to operate them.

This, in truth, would have completed the Communist lease of Cuba which President Kennedy all but signed when he pledged that the United States would not invade Cuba.

Certainly, there was no bipartisan approach to that noninvasion policy. The President simply did it and then told us so.

So, there is no such thing as a bipartisan foreign policy. There shouldn't be and I'll never be a party to any such arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is high time that we, as Members of the House of Representatives, particularly those on the Republican side, who believe in a sound foreign policy, should be told what is going on, if our foreign policy is to be bipartisan in its preparation and in its actual conduct. I know that under the Constitution, both past and present, this has not been done. I am not asking that it be done. But, at least what we should understand and what our people should be told, is that these decisions are the decisions of the President. The President has full and complete responsibility.

But, Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a statement was issued by the State Department pulling the props out from under the Prime Minister of Canada, Mr. Diefenbaker, by insisting that nuclear warheads go into Canada.

Now, I understand that the President was furious about that statement when he was apprised of it in the press. Yet, I did not hear that anyone lost his job. I did not hear that Secretary of State, Dean Rusk, who stated that he would accept the full responsibility for the statement, discharged anyone. I did not hear the President denounce anyone or deny the validity of the statement. Nor did I hear that anyone was discharged who was responsible for preparing or releasing the statement.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the Secretary of State had every means to find out who was responsible for it.

The decision was made at a meeting, or prior to a meeting down in Bermuda, between the President and the Prime Minister of Great Britain, Mr. Macmillan. It was decided to stop the production of the Skybolt missile, a missile that England was preparing its bomber force to use. No one I know of who had Republican Party responsibility, was called in, prior to that decision, and I am not sure that anybody with Republican responsibility was called in after the decision or informed that the decision was being made.

Mr. Speaker, for the good of our country we should as Members of Congress advise our constituents just what this so-called bipartisan foreign policy means. I am not, at this moment, just talking about the present administration. The term seems to be used almost every day. Only last week I read in the press about "Kennedy pledges leaders at secret session at the White House." And down further in the article there is one very significant paragraph:

There was some speculation at the session . . . was an effort by Mr. Kennedy to slam the door on any charges that his foreign policy was more partisan than bipartisan.

I am not in agreement with that paragraph because I do not charge the President and his foreign policy with being just a political foreign policy in that it

is partisan politically. I merely say it is a fact that he makes the decisions. It is his responsibility and the decision is not bipartisan. There is no basis for the implication that Republican leadership as well as Democratic leadership of the Congress had agreed to that policy before the decision was made. This is the point I am trying to make. It is the point I am going to insist upon. It is the point I am going to constantly and continuously advise the people in my district about whenever and wherever I can get the information across.

Mr. Speaker, that is about the gist of what I have to say. I want that to get in the Record just the same as the statements I shall issue from time to time.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BECKER. I would be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ALGER].

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the gentleman from New York in his discussion and his definition of the use and misuse of the word "bipartisan." My question is this: Does the gentleman not feel first of all that it is the prerogative, indeed, the duty of Members of Congress to be critical of foreign policy and, secondly, not to be shut off by the use of the word "bipartisan" as though they are not supposed to be critical of the foreign policy which affects all of us?

Mr. BECKER. This is exactly the intent of my remarks today. I believe that we would be irresponsible—irresponsible to the nth degree—if we attempted to roll over and play dead every time the President makes a mistake, whether it be our domestic or foreign policy.

The mistakes that have been made during the past 2 years, from the time of the Bay of Pigs invasion right on down the line to Laos—keep occurring. What happened recently during the so-called blockade of Cuba as to whether missiles were or were not in Cuba? What happened in the situation with reference to Canada? These things create a responsibility on the part of Members of Congress to let the American people know that we are not parties to that decision. I assure the gentleman I would not have been a party to them myself.

Mr. ALGER. If the gentleman will yield further, does the gentleman feel that some of the concern expressed now by the administration is the fear indeed of congressional criticism of policies that do not reflect the will of the people?

Mr. BECKER. I am quite sure of that. Permit me to call the attention of the gentleman to this: You know when the situation with the administration had become very, very critical and bad in recent months and when the people were catching up with it, you know what happened. They pulled a 50-mile hike out of the bag in order to get front-page publicity. They got important news off the front pages and off the radio and television. Instead we heard and read about 50-mile hikes. The minds of the people are supposed to be taken off the real problems confronting us. This is the type of thing that is going on, and I



1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

2821

think we should make the people understand why.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, may I comment further and ask another question of him?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, I have been asked by very dedicated Americans who are sincerely concerned, and who are also worried about criticism of the Commander in Chief if, indeed, we are weakening his posture and the posture of our Nation today when we are critical; so I want to ask the gentleman, Is there not even greater danger that if we stifle and eliminate freedom of speech in this country in order to defeat the enemy, we have actually adopted the enemy's techniques and have already been defeated by him, so that there does not need to be any party or parties, except one party and a dictatorship?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman is absolutely correct. I might call the gentleman's attention to an article that appeared yesterday in the Washington Star "Krock Calls Kennedy Policy Cynical on News." I suggest the gentleman read that article. I intend to put it in the Record.

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. ALGER. Do I understand that the gentleman speaking to us at this time will include the article just mentioned as part of his remarks?

Mr. BECKER. Mr. Speaker, I intend to include, after my remarks, the article by Arthur Krock which appeared in yesterday's Washington Star, the title of which I have just read.

Mr. Speaker, may I add this? The gentleman has hit on the most salient point of my discussion and what I am trying to do. It is simply this. Our people, by a virtually controlled press, it would seem, or news media, on news and information not only from the White House but from our departments of Government, including the State Department and the Department of Defense, are no longer being apprised of the facts and the truth of what is happening throughout the world. If we are going to let this go by under the guise of what is called bipartisan foreign policy then I say that we are subject justly to the wrath of the people. We should be condemned not only as individual Members of Congress but as individual citizens because we are not living up to our responsibility and to the oath that we have taken on this floor in every session since we became Members.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. AVERY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to return for just a moment to the reference that was made to the article in the Washington Star of yesterday by Mr. Krock. I think first it should be made clear in the Record at this point that Mr. Krock himself states that he is a personal friend of the President and has been a personal friend of the family for many years. So certainly this very

pointed criticism by Mr. Krock should not be viewed as a partisan comment. This was an observation of a highly respected and senior member of the Washington press corps. I think it should be pointed out in connection with this that apparently Mr. Krock's article drew some attention from the administration, because it is my understanding from an article in the Washington Post of Saturday morning that the administration now, under the direction of Mr. Sallinger, has proposed a "retreat" from spokesman for the administration and the press corps, so that either the press corps may better understand the administration, or else the administration may better understand the press corps.

I would hope however that whatever transpires at this retreat near Warrenton, Va., that representatives of the press will carry out the historic responsibility of that profession in America to defend their right to speak out and keep the public entirely informed.

Mr. BECKER. I certainly agree with the gentleman. I would hope the press would resume its responsibility from the publishers to the editors to the newsmen in publishing the news, in publishing and reporting as they always did the news and the facts as they see them, and not accept the brainwashing when they get down to this retreat.

Mr. AVERY. I think we ought to point out now that this controversy should not be confused with the Moss committee's 5-year project to guarantee the "right to know". As I understand the objective of the Moss committee, it is not the management of the news but relates to the Executive privilege of not making available to the press such information that is classified. The objection to making classified information available is entirely separate from the management or misrepresentation of the news as described by Mr. Krock.

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. YOUNGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. YOUNGER. In regard to Cuba, it seems to me as though we miss the point when we take so much time arguing about whether they have missiles or whether they have cannons or airplanes. It makes little difference whether they have those or whether they have slingshots. The Communists want a base of operations. Their technique and their method of operation is not military but is intrigue, infiltration, and sabotage. As long as any one Russian is there that danger exists. Is that not true?

Mr. BECKER. May I say to the gentleman that I do wish the American people had been better informed as to our objectives in imposing a blockade last year in Cuba, not merely to protect the security of the people of the United States from a missile attack but because this was a kickoff base not only to infiltrate subversively in all the countries of Latin America and South America but to help formulate guerrilla forces in those countries, to induce guerrilla op-

erations and revolution in those countries from a Communist base in Cuba. This is what we tried to do all last year and are still trying to do, but we still cannot get the show on the road, so to speak.

I might refer the gentleman to an article by a great and knowledgeable lady, which appeared in U.S. News & World Report. The author I refer to is a distinguished former Member of the House, Clare Booth Luce. The article last week deals with this very effectively. I am inserting the article in its entirety in the Record.

Mr. YOUNGER. The gentleman further realizes that a submarine base there is far more important than some of the missiles and other things?

Mr. BECKER. I agree with the gentleman, but we get into the area now of asking: Do we have proof the submarines are there? We do not have proof the submarines are not there. Do we have proof that missiles are there? We do not have proof missiles are not there. In other words, we have no proof. We tried to get it on the demand of the President last fall when he set up the blockade of Cuba. He should have stuck to his guns and insisted upon on-site inspection. If we were not strong enough to do it then, we ought to give up.

Mr. YOUNGER. I thank the gentleman, and congratulate him on his remarks and upon bringing this subject to the attention of the House.

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. PELLY. The gentleman has addressed the House on the subject of bipartisan foreign policy. I think the Record should show that the father of the bipartisan policy, Senator Vandenberg, made it very clear that he expected that foreign policy should be debated fully. I think his words actually were that it should be debated totally down to the water's edge. I think we should all remember that we do have a responsibility as a minority to discuss this subject fully but not to go out of our way to try to use any partisanship in our arguments.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution referring to the late Senator Vandenberg, because that was his position. I want to make this abundantly clear, that when the President made the decision on October 22 to blockade Cuba, we backed him up, but that does not mean we should roll over and play dead when he did not follow through.

Mr. STINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. STINSON. It would be a serious act on our part to sit here and do nothing. That is what I think the gentleman from New York was trying to bring out. Does the gentleman think there is any correlation between the timing of the announcement on the Cuban crisis, which happened just before the election, and the possibility this might have been

done for a political reason or a party reason?

Mr. BECKER. Far be it from me to charge President Kennedy with politics. Actually, I think he is one of the most astute politicians on the American scene in many, many a year.

While I do not know the President's intent it was certainly in my mind at the time and it did have its political effect.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent at this time to insert in the Record with my remarks an article concerning Arthur Krock in the Washington Star of yesterday and an article by Claire Boothe Luce, former Member of this House and a great lady and former Ambassador to Italy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. Hagan of Georgia). Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. HALL. With reference to the last point raised by our colleague about the timing and the political implication of the Cuban quarantine, or blockade, or whatever you want to call it, has the gentleman considered what a reversal of 2 weeks might have done to the November 1962 election—if instead of bringing out the Cuban situation 2 weeks before November 6 and the \$7.8 billion deficit 2 weeks after, if those 2 items had been reversed? I wonder what the complexion of this House would have been today in such an event. I wonder if the gentleman has given consideration to those two alterations of simple facts and timing from the political point of view?

Mr. BECKER. Let me assure my colleague, the gentleman from Missouri who is very astute, that I am never averse to considering political consideration and statements made and the timing of them. Certainly, I will say with all the sincerity at my command that I believe the President of the United States waited until the most dangerous time in all history to order the blockade of Cuba on October 22. This should have been done months before—not when we knew all these missiles were in there—and launching pads were being built. And as to the great distortions of facts, the question is going to come up in the next couple of weeks as to the time when we knew these missiles were in there, when photographs were taken. I am sure some factual material will come out in the next couple of weeks. As to the other part of your question, the \$7.8 billion deficit that was announced 2 weeks after election, I do not know whether in the minds of the people this would have had as much offsetting effect—I am talking about the political effect—as the Cuban blockade announced on October 22 because we all as American citizens were forced to make statements backing up the President's action at that time. We could not have done otherwise.

Mr. HALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. BECKER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HALL. I would like to say I was among the first to back the President and say that the die had been cast and we should rally and not let partisanship interfere with us or go beyond our shoreline at that particular point. Of course, I expected we would finish the job when we "drew the mark," and had everything in our favor. But I think if history is to be objective and to describe where the error was made, it will not be on this question of elections of last year, but will go clear back to the Bay of Pigs, April 17, 1961. Finally, I would say it takes more than a bad cold in Chicago to make one change the course of history and come back from the campaign trail and invoke a quarantine. It takes the feeling of the American people, and I would hope that just as the gentleman in the well of the House, my esteemed colleague from New York, is today bringing up the question of the amorality of not debating foreign policy, be it good, bad or indifferent, so would history in its objectivity point out when you expect to have a \$500 million excess in the budget as predicted in the state of the Union message and in the campaign message and in the 2d session of the 87th Congress budget message, then suddenly it turns into a \$7.8 billion deficit, announced like this—afterwards instead of before the election—it has its moral or lack of moral implication. I commend the gentleman on his expose and his expertise today in the well of the House.

Mr. BECKER. I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Missouri. We sit on the same committee and I know how well he does on that committee. Let me point this out. You have brought out something which is most important, when the President—and this talk goes on all the time—about bipartisanship—particularly in this administration—I wonder what he called it during the campaign of 1960 and prior Senator John F. Kennedy went from one end of this land to the other bemoaning a missile gap, day after day—one of the most dangerous things that any Member of this or any other body could do. He was telling our enemies that we were not prepared with missiles and that there was a great missile gap between what we had and what they had. And then Senator John F. Kennedy was going from one end of the land to the other constantly harping about our loss of prestige and about how low our prestige was in the world.

Well, I say to President John F. Kennedy: If you felt that way about our prestige at the time of the election how do you feel about our prestige today? You don't have to take any poll to know how low our prestige is now. If that was bipartisanship, Mr. Speaker, then I am right in what I am saying about bipartisanship today and that is why I think more of our Republicans must make their voices heard so the American people will have no doubt as to the facts. I want to call these facts to the attention of the American people, for it is badly needed.

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKER. I yield.

Mr. CLEVELAND. I would like to compliment the distinguished gentleman on his cogent remarks on bipartisanship. During the course of the gentleman's remarks the question of "news management" suggested itself. I had prepared for delivery in the House today some remarks on news management. They include the article about Mr. Arthur Krock, the distinguished New York Times correspondent which has been referred to by the gentleman. Also an Associated Press article regarding the Cuban news situation reporting the views of my esteemed colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. PELLY]. Finally, a statement from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by the distinguished gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MATHIAS]. I wonder if their relationship to news management would not be a little more effectively presented if the three articles were set out in the Record at one place?

Mr. BECKER. The gentleman wishes to insert it following my remarks?

Mr. CLEVELAND. Yes; if it can be done at this time.

Mr. BECKER. I am about finished. I have no objection.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I understand what the gentleman is attempting to do? Is he attempting to spread his remarks among those of the gentleman from New York, or afterward?

Mr. BECKER. After.

Mr. HALEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire.

There was no objection.

[From the Washington Star]

KROCK CALLS KENNEDY BOLD, CYNICAL ON NEWS

(By the Associated Press)

Arthur Krock, prize-winning newsman, accuses President Kennedy of managing the news with a cynicism, boldness and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

But, the veteran newsman says: "If Mr. Kennedy has achieved any success in these efforts, the principal onus rests in the printed and electronic press itself."

Mr. Krock, for 21 years chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist, levels his indictment in the March issue of Fortune magazine.

He cites, as an affront to Jeffersonian principles of a free press, "the 'information directives' prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden." He said the "weapon" of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error "in the aftermath of half-won showdowns—such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba."

HITS "SOCIAL FLATTERY"

Mr. Krock says Mr. Kennedy and high subordinates indirectly manage news by "social flattery of Washington reporters and commentators, and by 'selective personal patronage.'"

In the latter category he included exclusive interviews, attributable to the President, which he says have ceased to be a rarity.

"But Mr. Kennedy," he writes, "prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from



1963

2823

which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office.

"The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity."

Mr. Krock accuses Mr. Kennedy also of spreading "a false first impression" last year that a budget balance was in prospect. And he charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem which, Mr. Krock said, "is visibly growing worse."

There was no immediate White House comment on Mr. Krock's article. At his news conference last Thursday, the President said in response to a question: "Let me say we have had very limited success in managing the news, if that is what we have been trying to do."

#### LONGTIME FRIEND

Mr. Krock has been a longtime friend of the Kennedy family, and he told an Associated Press reporter that he is "absolutely personally fond" of President Kennedy.

In his Fortune article, Mr. Krock says that on the strength of almost 50 years as a newsman, he would make two judgments on what he calls "management of the news" by Mr. Kennedy and administration officials:

"1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been indorsed more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

"2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me.

#### OUTLINES KENNEDY METHODS

"In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press. Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West New Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. Charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to 'prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia, likely to result in nuclear war.' Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower administration."

"And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is 'furious.' (But nobody gets fired.)"

In conclusion, Mr. Krock says:

"But it is the indirect methods . . . by which 'management of the news' is chiefly accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public-relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator. Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers, and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase 'managing the purveyors of the news.' And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

[From U.S. News & World Report,  
Feb. 18, 1963]

#### CUBA CRISIS AND NUCLEAR ARMS—WHY DE GAULLE GOES HIS OWN WAY

(By Clare Boothe Luce)

The President was asked in his press conference [on January 24] what he thought of the theory put forward in Europe that the outcome of the Cuban crisis was linked in General de Gaulle's mind with his determination to have his own nuclear deterrent force, because Cuba showed that the United States would not defend Europe.

The President replied that this charge had, indeed, been directly made, and he indicated that some Europeans had deduced from the fact that the naval blockade had ended with Moscow in unchallenged control of Cuba that, "since the Soviet developed their own nuclear capacity there is a balance between the United States and the U.S.S.R. and neither would use it, and, therefore, Europe cannot rely on the United States." This he called peculiar logic.

But, after Cuba, not only "some, in some parts of Europe," but also many in many parts of America, and in Latin America, no longer believe in the U.S. commitment to defend other countries from communism, if to do so should mean to initiate a nuclear war with Soviet Russia.

And, the President's remarks notwithstanding, there is much recent evidence that Mr. Khrushchev himself is now thoroughly convinced that, once the 400,000 American troops in Germany are withdrawn, America's nuclear commitment will then extend no farther than its own coastline.

If memory serves, after the disastrous Bay of Pigs invasion Mr. Kennedy repeatedly warned Mr. Khrushchev that communism in this hemisphere was "not negotiable." Mr. Khrushchev, strongly suspecting that this warning was merely for U.S. domestic political consumption, boldly seized the opportunity to put it to the acid test: Fully aware that he would be detected in the end, he sneaked nuclear weapons into Cuba, and zeroed them in on the White House.

When the President found this out—quite a long while after Cuban intelligence sources had told him it was happening—his reaction was immediate. He called out the Navy, which called Mr. Khrushchev's brilliantly and carefully calculated bluff.

This was probably precisely what Mr. Khrushchev intended. Mr. Khrushchev had long been in the position of having to lose his face in order to save it. He wanted to lose his ugly nuclear "mug"—the face of the "nuclear aggressor." He was anxious to show the world that he was not the man to start a nuclear war against anybody over a third country, and he certainly wanted to have it made plain that Mr. Kennedy wasn't the man either. A solid basis for negotiations of all kinds—and popular fronts of all kinds—could be built on the foundations of a U.S.-U.S.S.R. nuclear-peace pact.

One can only imagine Mr. Khrushchev's satisfaction when his theory vis-à-vis the U.S. military position was proven correct. But he could hardly have been prepared for the next surprise. No sooner had he agreed to remove all the nuclear hardware U.S. air surveillance had spotted than Mr. Kennedy at once referred to him as a "great statesman" and, to show that there needn't be any hard feelings over the little episode, gave him Cuba.

Mr. Khrushchev did not naturally bother to return the President's compliment. He realized, of course, that it had been made to gentle him—Mr. Khrushchev is as easy to gentle as a king cobra.

A few weeks later at the East Berlin World Communist Congress Mr. Khrushchev was bragging to the world that his missile play in Cuba had achieved its real objective—to scare Mr. Kennedy into giving up

Cuba. After accepting the thunderous applause of the 2,500 Communist Party delegates present from 70 nations, Mr. Khrushchev vowed all over again to "bury us," this time with his 100-megaton bombs, but only if we were ever so rash as to initiate a nuclear attack on him.

Ever since Cuba, Mr. Khrushchev has worked hard on his new image. Each passing day he sounds more and more like John Foster Dulles: He will never launch missiles at the United States, or Europe, but he will—if attacked—produce "massive retaliation."

The fact is that Mr. Khrushchev had long ago opted for nuclear peace with the U.S.A. Since Cuba, he knows that the United States has also opted for nuclear peace with Soviet Russia. There is today an undeclared nuclear-peace pact between the U.S.S.R. and the United States for the simple reason that the initiation of nuclear war is not to the best interests of either.

The United States press, following the President's lead, is currently taking a benign view of Mr. Khrushchev's new nuclear posture. Besides, it feels so good since he stopped poking his Cuban missiles into our solar plexus. The vials of their wrath have been saved up for Gen. Charles de Gaulle, who has had the gall to say, since Cuba, that he thinks France would now certainly be more safe under its own nuclear umbrella than under America's.

#### FRANCO-RUSSIAN DEAL? "PREPOSTEROUS"

Because of this, General de Gaulle's "image" is being rapidly worked over, with the enthusiastic help of the American left, to resemble a half-mad Napoleon, or an Abominable No-man. It is even being suggested that General de Gaulle wishes France to become a nuclear power in order to make a deal over Germany with Russia. This is to suggest that France desires to have Russia on her own borders, instead of Germany's, which is, of course, preposterous. If either France or Germany falls to the Reds, all Europe falls with them, and every European knows it.

It is interesting to inquire what General de Gaulle was doing the first tense hours of the United States naval blockade, while Soviet missiles were being leveled by Russian troops on American cities.

Was he threatening to pull out of the grand alliance if the United States invaded Cuba?

Was he begging us to throw the whole business into the U.N.?

Was he reminding us that the French feel that the United States let France down in Indochina, Algeria, and Suez, so France couldn't be expected to sympathize with our troubles about Cuba?

Was he advising President Kennedy to make a deal with Khrushchev about Cuba fast, because if the United States invaded Cuba Khrushchev might retaliate by striking at West Berlin and thus trigger world war III?

He was not. The general was offering to fight by the side of the United States if we felt our vital interests required us to kick Castro and Khrushchev both out of Cuba. And by this very fact he was pledging France to take all the nuclear risks we felt we might be incurring.

The President, in his recent press conference, acknowledged that General de Gaulle "responded when we were in difficulty in Cuba." "But" he added, with some extraordinarily peculiar logic of his own, "I would hope that our confidence in him would be matched by his confidence in us."

This whole sentence must have been a typographical error.

The President had just admitted a period back that, when we were in difficulties, President de Gaulle had shown the ultimate in confidence by his willingness to risk nuclear

war—if risk there was—by the side of America.

What the President really meant to say, of course, was that, whereas President de Gaulle had shown confidence in us at the time of the naval blockade, the final U.S. political capitulation to Khrushchev and Castro had diminished that confidence, and that the President hoped that somehow it could be restored.

The hope is an idle one. The fault is by no means entirely the President's. France has grown economically strong enough to stand on her own legs. It would follow naturally, in any case, that she should desire sooner or later to stand on her own legs militarily.

The significance of the two Kennedy back-downs over Cuba is that what was a desire now seems—or at least to General de Gaulle—to be an urgent necessity for France's own survival.

The character of the U.S. nuclear commitment made in 1946 changed in the 1950's when Russia became itself a nuclear power. Today, as in 1946, that commitment is to launch a nuclear attack on Soviet Russia if she moves against Germany.

But in 1963 the same commitment means a willingness to destroy the United States for the sake of Europe. When the matter is put in this blunt fashion, how many Americans are for it?

Khrushchev took the full measure of President Kennedy and U.S. public opinion in the Cuban crisis. So did Charles de Gaulle. His conclusion: If the war chips should ever go down in Europe, the United States will not initiate nuclear war on Russia until Russia wages nuclear war on America—and vice versa. The effect of this undeclared nuclear pact is to subtract both U.S. and U.S.S.R. nuclear forces from the European military equation.

Europe is today, without its own nuclear force, a limited war area. Consequently the outcome of any European conflict would then be decided by Russia's 125 divisions and NATO's 23—or a negotiation.

Militarily Europe is Germany and France. Their choice today is as plain as the nose on General de Gaulle's face. It is to get their own nuclear umbrella or to trust the United States, if they are attacked by Russian conventional weapons, to launch her missiles at Russia, knowing that she would get Russia's 100-ton megaton bombs right back.

General de Gaulle has made the only choice a patriotic Frenchman could possibly make. Like the rational Frenchman he is, he chooses to build up his own nuclear establishment.

He knows that the day U.S. troops are pulled out of Germany, France will be unable to defend itself without its own nuclear force.

In his youth, President Kennedy wrote a book called "Why England Slept." It described how England, in 1939, was caught militarily napping by the Germans, and its very sound thesis was that no nation can afford to wait until it is attacked to prepare its own defenses, and that, above all, it cannot rely on the military or economic strength even of its allies to save it from destruction.

#### UNITED STATES PULLS OUT OF EUROPE

Charles de Gaulle has paid the author of "Why England Slept" the compliment of taking his advice. He does not intend to be caught napping if at some future date the United States, in order to prevent a world holocaust—and its own destruction—yanks its nuclear umbrella away from Europe.

It is hard to see what is "Napoleonic" about a Frenchman's desire to protect France, or why the desire to remove France from the category of a limited war area should be considered a folie de grandeur. What is much more a folie de grandeur is the desire of the United States to keep Europe a United States nuclear colonial area

and to keep Great Britain, France, and Germany forever in the United States nuclear nursery.

(Mr. ALGER (at the request of Mr. BELL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ALGER. Mr. Speaker, in my view bipartisanship in foreign affairs is wrong. Agreements may indeed occur between members of both parties inasmuch as Americans do indeed stand together as a Nation in a hostile world. The ties that bind Americans are far greater than the divisive forces at work in the world today that separate us from Socialist-Communist societies. Our Republic and our people, blessed with freedom are a world apart from Communists and those dictatorships that deny freedom and self-determination to their people.

But agreements that result in bipartisan harmony must never preclude, foreclose or in any way or to any degree limit freedom of speech. Most of all, in foreign affairs we must freely express our views. More heads are better than a few. Our free criticisms result in a final policy which Americans will support as we have many times. But these decisions and policies were amalgams of many and various views, sometimes highly critical. Our Republic's strength is in our differences and contrasts of views that result in thorough analysis. If now we must abandon our right to speak freely and criticize then indeed our constituents are voiceless, are not represented and we have a dictatorship—the very form of government we abhor the most. Let us not adopt the enemy's views in order to discredit and defeat him.

Indeed, our very lack of policy today—the so-called no-win policy, the bewildering conflicts of U.S. sovereignty and U.N. decisions, the countless forms of aid to the enemy that we give in many kinds of foreign aid, the suicidal acceptance of Monroe Doctrine violation, the supine refusal to stand up for U.S. sovereignty as we back down in concessions to countless demands by Communists—these and more partially demonstrate, I believe, our error in having adopted a posture of so-called bipartisan foreign policy.

As the gentleman from New York (Mr. BECKER) said, the unilateral decisions of President Kennedy are not the policies and decisions of Republicans. The mistakes under this administration in foreign policy are not, therefore, Republican mistakes. Nor should mistakes—and there are now many—be whitewashed or buried from view by blocking criticism by accepting a policy of bipartisan agreement.

Indeed, on the contrary, the administration should right now be championing a foreign policy so firm, so clearly understood by all, so protective of U.S. sovereignty, that it could withstand all Republican criticism—or if it cannot—then the valid criticisms of Republicans should be recognized, analyzed, and adopted.

It is at this point that this administration's lack of policy breaks down so clearly. The lack of overall policy and

the fitful reacting without a basic policy to the various threats to freedom and peace as they arise in the world are now the reason, apparently, for the President calling for bipartisanship—so that the mistakes will be glossed over and the blame not cast on him. The President cannot escape this responsibility but more important—the countless mistakes of Cuba, Vietnam, Laos, the Congo, France, Canada, and Latin America must be corrected. So it is that the President's only hope, as I see it, is to call on the Republicans—correct the continuing mistakes and protect our Nation and her people. Not dodge, delay, or sidestep the continuing errors that need correction now.

As a starting point let me suggest that we reimpose the Monroe Doctrine, clarify the Vietnam war where Americans are being killed in a war that is not a war, eliminate the foreign aid that goes to the enemy, the Communists, and stop supporting the United Nations aid to the enemy.

There are other solutions available to troublesome problems if the President would first not worry about covering up criticism by bipartisan appeals; second, contradict those in the administration who say it is proper for government to lie to her people; third, get about really protecting U.S. sovereignty instead of apologizing for U.S. determination to protect freedom, justice, and decency, and finally stop managing the news, preferring at last to confide in the people, telling them and us, their representatives, what world situations really are, so that we can all join in protecting ourselves and our beloved land.

#### NEWS MANAGEMENT

Mr. CLEVELAND. Mr. Speaker, expanding means of communication have created a promise of better news coverage for Americans. From a technical viewpoint, we must applaud such achievements as Telstar.

However, in the age of Telstar, Mazors, and the like, a new phenomenon has arisen known as news management. Some aspects of news management are reminiscent of George Orwell's 1984.

My distinguished colleague from Maryland called attention to this phenomenon in a statement on the House floor February 21, 1963.

The reprint of the statement follows:

#### WASHINGTON "CON" MEN

Mr. MATHIAS. Mr. Speaker, the Attorney General is ignoring a confidence game being played in Washington and so we must warn the public about it. The object of the game is to use the people's money to bamboozle them on a national scale. The scheme is simple. An administration tipster calls a political favorite who has played no prior part and breaks the news of the award of a Government contract in his State. The favorite then calls the news media at home and releases the glad tidings with at least the implication that he is making a personal benefaction to his constituents.

Honest citizens who are familiar with complex Government procurement procedures are not impressed. Reporters, editors, and newscasters are not fooled by this hocus-pocus. Let us hope that they will expose it for the deception that it is.

1963

On Sunday, February 24, 1963, the Washington Post and Times Herald printed the views of the distinguished columnist, Mr. Arthur Krock, concerning news management. It says:

**KROCK CHARGES CYNICAL NEWS MANAGEMENT, DISTORTION TO KENNEDY**

Arthur Krock, prize-winning newsman, accuses President Kennedy of managing the news with a cynicism, boldness, and subtlety unmatched in peacetime history.

But, the veteran newsman says, if Mr. Kennedy has achieved any success in these efforts, "the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

Krock, for 21 years chief of the Washington bureau of the New York Times and more recently a Times Washington columnist, levels his indictment in the March issue of Fortune magazine.

He cites, as an affront to Jeffersonian principles of a free press, "the 'informational directives' prescribed for the Pentagon and the Department of State when the crisis over Cuba began to harden." He said the "weapon" of news management has been improperly used to inflate success or gloss over error "in the aftermath of half-won showdowns, such as President Kennedy's with respect to the Soviet rearmament of Cuba."

Krock says Mr. Kennedy and high subordinates indirectly manage news by social flattery of Washington reporters and commentators, and by "selective personal patronage."

In the latter category he included exclusive interviews, attributable to the President, which he says have ceased to be a rarity.

"But Mr. Kennedy," he writes, "prefers the intimate background briefings of journalists, and their publishers, on a large scale, from which members emerge in a state of protracted enchantment evoked by the President's charm and the awesome aura of his office."

"The success of his efforts is attested by a continent-wide glow in news reporting, editorializing, and comment, which otherwise might register the lower temperature of impersonal objectivity."

Krock accuses Mr. Kennedy also of spreading "a false first impression" last year that a budget balance was in prospect. And he charges administration officials with anonymous prevarication on such subjects as the balance-of-payments problem, which, Krock said, "is visibly growing worse."

There was no immediate White House comment on Krock's article. At his news conference last Thursday, Mr. Kennedy said in response to a question: "Let me say we have had very limited success in managing the news if that is what we have been trying to do."

When the questioner, correspondent May Craig, remarked that she doesn't believe in managed news at all and thinks "we ought to get everything we want," the President brought a laugh by replying: "Well, I think that you should, too, Miss Craig; I am for that."

Krock, 76, first covered the National Capital during the administration of William Howard Taft. As chief of the Times Washington bureau, 1932-53, he won two Pulitzer Prizes and a citation equivalent to third.

He has been a long-time friend of the Kennedy family, and he told an Associated Press reporter that he is "absolutely personally fond" of President Kennedy.

In writing that quotable exclusive interviews with the President no longer are rare, as they formerly were, Krock recalls the protests that arose from the Washington press corps when President Franklin D. Roosevelt gave one in 1937, and President

Harry S. Truman gave another in 1950. Both interviews were obtained by Krock.

Asked whether he believes those Presidents did wrong in giving the interview and whether he feels that he should not have participated in them, Krock said:

"Not at all. It served their (the Presidents') purpose and they were doing me no favor."

He said the two Presidents felt that "the best and most effective medium" of publicizing what they had to say was the New York Times.

In his Fortune article, Krock says that on the strength of almost 50 years as a newsman, he would make two judgments on what he calls "management of the news" by Mr. Kennedy and administration officials:

1. A news management policy not only exists but, in the form of direct and deliberate action, has been enforced more cynically and boldly than by any previous administration in a period when the United States was not in a war or without visible means of regression from the verge of war.

2. In the form of indirect but equally deliberate action, the policy has been much more effective than direct action in coloring the several facets of public information, because it has been employed with subtlety and imagination for which there is no historic parallel known to me.

"In the narrow twilight zone between the direct and indirect methods, the administration incessantly resorts to three ways to push its news product that work deplorably well with the press.

"Vulnerable and/or discreditable acts in foreign policy—such as forcing the Dutch to surrender West Guinea to Indonesian blackmail, promoting U.N. charter violation in the Congo, etc.—are explained on the purely assumptive ground that they were necessary to prevent a confrontation with Soviet Russia likely to result in nuclear war.

"Executive decisions sure to be unpopular are explained as in line with or compelled by policies adopted by the Eisenhower Administration.

"And when the White House is the center of such revelations of ineptness in the Kennedy regime as our public intrusion in the Canadian parliamentary debate on nuclear policy, his subordinates make oath that the President, though daily represented as omniscient, knew nothing about it and is 'furious' (but nobody gets fired)."

In conclusion, Krock says:

"But it is the indirect methods . . . by which 'managements of the news' is chiefly accomplished by the Kennedy administration. This is a public relations project and the President is its most brilliant operator.

"Since the immediate objectives of this selling job are the news reporters in general (most definitely including the TV and radio broadcasters), widely read commentators and flattered editors, publishers and network moguls in particular, the project is much more accurately identified by the phrase 'managing the purveyors of the news.' And for any degree to which this project has been successful the principal onus rests on the printed and electronic press itself."

On the same page of the Washington Post and Times Herald, there appeared a story entitled "Representative Pelly Says State Misled Congress, Press."

The statement is herewith inserted in the RECORD:

**REPRESENTATIVE PELLY SAYS STATE MISLED CONGRESS, PRESS**

A Republican Member of Congress charged the State Department yesterday with deliberately misleading Members of Congress and the press last fall on the Cuban situation.

Representative THOMAS M. Pelly, of Washington, registered his complaint in a letter to Assistant Secretary of State Frederick G. Dutton.

Last September 25, Pelly said, the State Department informed Members of Congress that there was no evidence of any organized combat force in Cuba from any Soviet-bloc country. On the same day he received his summary, Pelly said, Assistant Secretary of Defense William Bundy was telling a House Military Appropriations Subcommittee in secret session that missile sites of an offensive nature were being constructed in Cuba.

"I believe the facts regarding the offensive military buildup in Cuba were in the possession of the Department of State when you issued the summary stating there was no evidence of Cuban offensive capabilities, including offensive ground-to-ground missiles under Soviet direction or guidance," Pelly said in his letter to Dutton.

#### FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF SIXTEENTH AMENDMENT

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Washington [Mr. Pelly] is recognized for 60 minutes.

(Mr. Pelly asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter and a table.)

Mr. Pelly. Mr. Speaker, 50 years ago today the State of Wyoming became the 36th State of the Union to ratify the 16th amendment to the Constitution of the United States. Thereupon, three-fourths of the several States had acted favorably in pursuance of a joint resolution of the Congress to authorize a Federal income tax. The U.S. Senate had passed this resolution on July 5, 1909, and by a vote of 318 to 4, the House had passed it a week later.

Mr. Speaker, little did the Members of Congress of that day realize the extent to which their action would change Government and the federal system. Little did Cordell Hull and other supporters of this tax realize its ultimate effect. Actually, it was believed the tax would never exceed 2 percent.

Today, Mr. Speaker, our House Committee on Ways and Means is holding hearings on proposed reduction and reform of the income tax, and for me, as for my colleagues and the taxpayers we represent, it is a time for us to decide as to what is best in the way of lowering and improving the tax structure.

In this connection, I have been reading the proceedings of the 61st Congress, 1st session, and have reviewed the debate on the resolution to amend the Constitution, which was Senate Joint Resolution 40.

Actually, the issue was not one of taxing incomes of individuals equally, but rather to overcome a U.S. Supreme Court decision which held that under the then language of the Constitution, Congress was not authorized to levy a tax on corporations, because that would not be apportioning the taxes equally as between States.

Mr. Speaker, the 16th amendment, according to its advocates, was to be a war power that could be vital to the existence of the country. But it was not to be a peacetime tax.



I want to read today to the House in commemoration—if that is a proper term—and in any event in sadness, certain excerpts from the House debate on Senate Joint Resolution 40, but I point out first, Mr. Speaker, that this was a tax measure which originated in the Senate, contrary to the Constitution. Most of our fiscal problems, in my opinion, have originated in the other body. If only the House had originally been given sole and exclusive power by the Constitution over taxes and expenditures, there would be no national debt of any consequence today, nor any need for such a burdensome system of taxation, requiring at the moment admittedly much in the way of reduction and reform.

However, Mr. Speaker, then as now, there were some wise heads in the House. Listen to what Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, said on July 12, 1909. Compare the vision and views of this erstwhile Member of the House with the opinions and political foresight of some of Massachusetts' sons and political leaders of today.

Here are Mr. McCall's words as to equal taxation and representation in regard to the proposed change in the system of taxation:

In the Constitutional Convention, States having only one-third of the population of the country were in a majority; but today States having only one-sixth of the population elect a majority of the Senate, and yet it is proposed to throw away incontinently this important safeguard of the Constitution, this great democratic feature, and the Democratic Party proposes to take a hand and throw the rule of apportionment to the winds. I submit that if you are going to give up the rule of apportionment, you should confer upon the representatives of the people some compensating power to take the place of the safeguard you take away. You should at least provide that the House and the Senate should not amend them; that its power should be confined either to vetoing or accepting them—the power which the House of Lords in Great Britain has in reference to all tax bills.

Mr. Speaker, again let me quote Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts. His arguments made against the income tax amendment are interesting:

So, Mr. Speaker, while they say that they desire this power for time of war, we see today in time of peace the attempt to exercise the power to its utmost extent. And why not, then, limit it expressly to time of war? Why not, for the just protection and the equal rights of the people of New York and of the other great States of this Union, five of which probably will pay nine-tenths of an income tax, although they will have only one-ninth of the representation in the Senate—why not preserve the limitation upon the power of the Central Government? Why drag every governmental power to Washington so that a vast centralized government may devour the States and the liberty of the individual as well? I say this amendment should be more carefully considered than it has yet been considered.

It is liable to go into the Constitution of the United States and be forever a part of the organic law in the form of which it has been. I may almost say, extemporized or improvised. The character of the argument which has been made, that this tax is for use in time of war, leads me to ob-

serve that the chief purpose of the tax is not financial, but social. It is not primarily to raise money for the State, but to regulate the citizen and to regenerate the moral nature of man. The individual citizen will be called on to lay bare the innermost recesses of his soul in affidavits, and with the aid of the Federal inspector, who will supervise his books and papers and business secrets, he may be made to be good, according to the notions of virtue at the moment prevailing in Washington. And, incidentally, and since every business secret in the country can be had access to by the authorities at Washington, the citizen may be made to see his political duty if you happened to have a President who confused the attainment of his ambition with the highest good of the universe and was willing to abuse his power in order to coerce the citizen. You are creating here an ideal condition for corruption and for the political Jack Cade of the future to levy blackmail.

A statement by a Member from Connecticut, Mr. Hill, is worth reading. In his remarks, he said:

I am a firm believer that in times of peace the revenues of this country should be derived from customs duties and internal-revenue taxes, and that if these are not sufficient, as prudent people we ought to reduce our expenses to a point where they will be covered by such revenues.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read also from the remarks of Representative Harrison, of New York. He favored the bill, but listen to this wishful bit of thinking. Mr. Harrison said:

If the resolution prevails, it should be incumbent on the conferees upon the tariff to drop immediately from consideration the proposed corporation tax put into the bill by the Senate. This resolution now before the House provides for the taxing of incomes from whatever source derived. That means taxes upon incomes of corporations as well as individuals. In my opinion the corporation tax as it passed the Senate is unconstitutional; but if this resolution prevails, and the States gives us the constitutional right to pass a law taxing the incomes of corporations as well as individuals, such doubts will be at once removed. Moreover, as it now stands, alone, without an individual income tax, the corporation tax is the most grossly unfair impost ever levied by motion of either Chamber of Congress. It is unfair because it will allow one man with a \$100,000 income to go free, while another man who may get \$10,000 in income must pay the tax because his business is incorporated. It allows the man conducting a grocery business upon one corner of the street to go scotfree, while another man that carries on the same business on the next corner of the same street is obliged to pay a tax because he has incorporated his business. It thus violates the fundamental principle of taxation, namely, that its burdens should be equally distributed.

Mr. Harrison's remarks bring to my mind, Mr. Speaker, that an inequitable and heavy burden of taxes such as constitutes the income tax today was one of the major objectives of the Communist Manifesto. Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels wrote their guidebook to communism in 1848, and one of their key points was to tax the middle class into submission. In his directive to the proletariat, Marx flatly said a heavy progressive or graduated income tax was essential to destroy capitalism.

Mr. Speaker, frankly, it must be recognized that under the cold war condi-

tions and continuing world crises, the Treasury of the United States needs revenue. However, when we hear the advocating of tax cuts without any spending curtailment in order to increase the employment and stimulate business, I keep thinking of Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels. Would not all this massive spending with no tax revenues to provide for it delight those two masters of mischief?

On this 50th anniversary of the income tax, let me show the progress in the direction urged by those two men. Here is a tabulation of per capita Federal tax receipts showing the changes in tax rates in selected fiscal years from 1789-1962. This table is from "Facts and Figures on Government Finance," published by Tax Foundation, Inc. It indicates the trend toward Marxism:

Per capita Federal tax receipts	
Year	Per capita
1789-91	\$1.12
1800	1.92
1810	1.22
1820	1.61
1830	1.75
1840	.81
1850	1.75
1860	1.73
1870	9.72
1880	6.31
1890	8.03
1900	7.07
1910	6.89
1920	54.81
1930	29.78
1940	43.56
1941	59.28
1942	101.16
1943	168.54
1944	314.63
1945	334.04
1946	303.53
1947	285.71
1948	295.72
1949	278.63
1950	268.32
1951	342.23
1952	431.67
1953	454.60
1954	447.78
1955	415.15
1956	461.64
1957	484.30
1958	474.93
1959	466.69
1960	527.17
1961	530.97
1962	550.64

In discussing the results of the income tax, I think mention especially should be made as to its effect on Government. On this subject, let me quote from an address of Alfred J. Schweppe before the North Carolina State bar on October 26, 1962. Listen to this:

Actually the first big step in the direction of unlimited Federal power was the 16th amendment adopted in 1913 authorizing Congress to levy, without limit, a tax on incomes from whatever source derived. Those persons who at the time strongly objected to this unlimited taxing power were soothed with the pious declaration that it was inconceivable that the tax on incomes would ever go over 2 percent. Congress passed the first Income Tax Act in 1916. Within 2 years during World War I it went up to 85 percent on the highest incomes, and is today, and for many years last past, has been in the same general area. So far as the 16th amendment is concerned, it permits a 100-

tional Atomic Energy Agency, \$32,500. Preliminary investigations, \$3,000.

The American officials with whom I have checked about this project tell me they presume that the agricultural research under this program would involve the use of radioactive isotopes, but they remain uncertain about just where these isotopes for Yugoslavia will come from.

As this House knows, I am a doctor. As a doctor I am familiar with the many uses for isotopes in medical research. I know also that such tracer isotopes are equally valuable in plant and animal research and in work with fertilizers.

Most of the isotopes used in the United States are produced by the Atomic Energy Commission's Oak Ridge, Tenn., Laboratories. But I have been told by the AEC that it is highly unlikely that a license could be issued and American isotopes provided to a Communist bloc nation.

However, isotopes are available from any nation that can produce them via nuclear reactors or electron accelerators. The United Kingdom sells some commercially, I understand, and the Soviet Union and Czechoslovakia also have reactors.

Yugoslavia also has a small research reactor, but it is not certain whether that reactor can produce the isotopes necessary for this United Nations program.

It must be noted here that isotopes once provided have many other uses than agricultural research. They can be used, for instance, to trace the flow of liquids and gases in pipelines, and to test and measure strengths and dimensions of metals and other materials. Isotopes also can be used in studies of insecticides and other biological and chemical materials including materials for chemical and bacteriological warfare.

In short, these radioactive, nuclear isotopes are not the sort of thing which American taxpayers should be helping to provide or to buy for the use of the Communist bloc.

The Members of this House may be assured that I am continuing my investigation into this vital matter concerning nuclear research in Red Yugoslavia subsidized by the American taxpayer. One would think that even our one-worldly State Department would have learned the lesson of experience long ago—that there no longer is any justification for wooing or trying to purchase the loyalty of another sovereign nation, particularly a Communist nation.

Mr. Speaker, in connection with the uses of radioactive isotopes, I am including at this point in my remarks portions of an article from a special report of the U.S. Atomic Energy Commission listing a number of the uses for these isotopes in industry, medicine and agriculture:

#### AGRICULTURAL USES OF ISOTOPES

In agriculture, radioisotopes are an important tool that is helping scientists to unlock secrets of the growth of plants and animals and the pests and diseases that injure or destroy them. They are contributing to increasing productivity and better economy. They have been applied in a variety

of research on plant nutrition, crop diseases, fertilizer application and effectiveness, soil conditions, animal diseases, milk production, insect eradication, and development of new plant varieties through mutations. Over \$5 million per year of agricultural research is performed with radioisotopes.

Agricultural research often requires years to mature because of crop cycles, and additional time which elapses before results can be applied on the farms. Except in a few instances, the agricultural benefits of isotopes lie chiefly in the future.

#### MEDICAL USES

Following the discovery of radium in 1898, medical researchers soon recognized the possibilities of using radioactivity.

The supremacy of radioactive elements as tracers to define physiological processes is readily apparent in medical and biological fields. The tracers correspond in size and kind to the thing they trace. They are not foreign or chemically different—they are the material or a true part thereof. Some disease processes that have been studied are cancer, leukemia, heart malfunctions, arteriosclerosis, virus infections, multiple sclerosis, arthritis, anemia, gout, and nutritional deficiencies.

In addition to such universal use of tracers for biomedical research, radioisotopes have made possible some advances in medical diagnosis. Dynamic tracer diagnostic tests of the functions of organs in patients have been developed for thyroid, heart, liver, kidney, bone marrow, and spleen. Tracer tests are used routinely for the total volume of plasma, blood or water in the body, for lifetime of blood cells, and for localization of tumors, particularly of the brain. Over 2,000 hospitals or medical groups use isotopes for diagnosis.

In the area of radiation treatment, radioisotopes found early applications in medicine. Many of the therapeutic uses, particularly in cancer treatment, follow the principles established with X-rays and radium. Radioisotopes have greatly extended these treatments. At the end of 1959 over 300 radioisotope teletherapy units were licensed for use in the United States alone. These units may contain as much as several thousand curies of either cobalt 60 or cesium 137.

#### INDUSTRIAL USES

Most of the widespread applications of radioisotopes that industry has developed use very little radiation and fall into two categories: radioisotopes for tracing, and small radiation source for gaging or testing.

Radiotracing applications now in use include: wear and lubrication tests to find best lubricants and conditions of operation, involving piston rings, gears, and machine parts; wear tests on paints, varnishes, wax coatings, and other protective agents; study of detergents and various cleaning agents on cloth and fabrics; finding leaks inside complicated systems and underground gas storage depots; tracing flow in pipelines, streams, catalytic crackers, chemical processing plants, and fluid or slurry systems.

In the area of radioinspection, industry has expanded radioisotope radiography as an efficient and cost-saving way of meeting the higher quality and greater safety specifications required for many products today—both for civilian and military use. Welds are routinely radiographed with radioisotope cameras on ships, tanks, pipelines, and containment vessels. Such radioeyes also are used to tell whether the fuel in rockets meets the rigid requirements of uniformity so necessary for successful operation. Construction of a single ship often requires the radiographing of as many as 10,000 welds. The savings in rejects and elimination of destructive tests for welds, casts, and other fabricated products, is significant. Even

more important is the greatly reduced chance of failures and accidents. Another important factor is radiation beam inspection of rapidly moving packages, cans, sheet material, metal strip, and fluid products. Isotope gages have been developed to penetrate through or reflect from material to measure levels, content, thickness, or density of a number of kinds of products.

A broad scope of products now is controlled and improved by isotope gages. Since they permit products to be made much more uniform and of higher quality, the user or consumer benefits directly as well as indirectly through the assistance isotopes can give to improved efficiency and productivity to aid segments of the economy.

High intensity radiation is starting to receive its first routine uses, but its full development depends on considerable research. The intense radiation from large quantities of fission products may ultimately find use as a new industrial process reagent and create new products. Some types of grafted plastics, such as selective ion exchange membranes used in desalting sea water, can best be produced by irradiation.

#### DEVELOPMENT OF RADIATION INSTRUMENTS

Since the human senses cannot detect nuclear radiations except at extremely high levels, the development of systems of detection and measurement of radiation has been essential to development of the practical applications of radioisotopes. The design and manufacture of such instruments was the first branch of the private atomic energy industry established. Many instruments originally were designed and manufactured in the Government's atomic laboratories, but immediately after the war the Commission supported development of commercial manufacture. Significant advances have been made by industry in the development of more stable and sensitive circuits for radioisotope measuring applications. By 1959 some 120 companies were manufacturing a variety of instruments, detectors, special components, and accessories.

Nuclear radiation detectors developed to date may be classified according to several types.

In pulse systems, the output of the detector consists of a series of signals, each of which represents the interaction of a nuclear particle or gamma ray with the detector. The well-known Geiger counter is an example of a pulse detector. Another is the proportional counter which is able to identify different radioisotopes according to their characteristic radiations. Still another example is the scintillation counter which operates on the principle that when ionizing particles pass through certain crystals, liquids, or organic polymers, flashes of light (scintillations) are emitted. An electron multiplier phototube picks up the faint scintillations and amplifies the resulting pulses to be detected and identified by the measuring apparatus.

In nonpulse detection systems, the output is the average of the cumulative effects due to many interactions of radiation with the detector; no attempt is made to resolve the individual events. The current-producing ionization chamber is a good example; the output is proportional to the total ionization current produced within the detector. Another example is the photographic system. When a piece of film is exposed to radiation, the emulsion reacts in the same way as when struck by visible light. The amount of radiation can be estimated from darkening of the film. Colorimetric detection is another example. When radiation reacts with certain chemicals containing chlorine (i.e., trichlorethylene and water, or chloroform and water), hydrochloric acid is formed. This causes a change in color of certain dyes, and the degree of color change

produced is dependent upon the amount of radiation received.

Several other detector systems have been used for specialized problems. These include cloud chambers for laboratory studies, nuclear-track photographic emulsion plates, crystal conducting counters, chemical detectors, and colorimetric devices for detection of large doses of radiation. In addition, a number of systems have been designed to detect and measure neutrons. Most of these have used boron, lithium or cadmium, in conjunction with one of the detector types discussed (except colorimetric), to detect the secondary radiation resulting from neutron capture by these materials.

In the field of low-level counting, university work on radiocarbon dating of archaeological materials was important in early developments. Noteworthy in this field was the pioneering research on the screen wall counter by W. F. Libby at the Universities of California and Chicago. Libby's technique involved placement of the sample inside a counter that operated on the sensitive and simple Geiger principle.

In more recent years, some investigators have substituted acetylene gas synthesized from radiocarbon samples used in proportional counters for the screen wall counter. Other techniques are based on a variety of liquid scintillators that respond well to soft beta radiation when the sample is mixed with the liquid scintillators.

These developments in low-level counting are pointing a way for applying these techniques to industrial processing. Present-day instrumentation is suitable only for laboratory needs, and designs must be modified to meet the rigid requirements of industrial applications.

### THE STRANGE CASE OF PEREZ JIMENEZ

MR. RIEHLMAN asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the body of the Record.)

MR. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is tremendous interest among some of my constituents about the plight of Perez Jimenez, former President of Venezuela, now in Florida, who is involved in extradition proceedings brought by the U.S. Government.

One of my constituents has sent me an article dealing with this subject from the Wanderer of January 10, 1963, with the request that it be printed in the Record.

I have also studied the State Department paper on this subject and, although I may not agree entirely with either treatment of the matter, I think it will serve a useful purpose to place them here side by side.

The article follows:

**THE STRANGE CASE OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ**  
(Condensed from an account in Popular, Miami Spanish-language weekly, December 30, 1962.)

Certain legal cases, due to a strange series of incidents, coincidences and paradoxes, tend to become famous in the annals of jurisprudence. The case of Marcos Perez Jimenez has all the indications of becoming one of these cases. The former President of Venezuela is now languishing in a Dade County jail, held virtually incommunicado, and subjected to the treatment usually accorded highly dangerous convicted felons.

Why?

No person in authority can give, or dares to give, a reasonable answer.

Has the ex-President violated any U.S. law? No.

Has the ex-President been convicted in Venezuela?

No.

Has the ex-President, holder of the U.S. coveted Legion of Merit, with the rank of commander in chief, broken any conditions imposed upon political exiles in the United States?

Again, no.

Then why is he imprisoned and denied benefit of bond? There are many apparent answers. For one thing, his arch-enemy, President Betancourt of Venezuela, has hired a very influential law firm in Washington in an effort to satiate his vengeance on Perez Jimenez. The law firm is headed by Presidential Adviser Dean Acheson.

Perez Jimenez has been denied the right to post bond. Spies and saboteurs are granted this right in the United States. Why is it denied in this case?

Betancourt of Venezuela wants it that way.

As a former Communist leader, Betancourt can do no wrong. He's even the darling of most of the U.S. press which consistently views Communist dictators as "premiers" or "chairmen," never as bloody autocrats. This name is only reserved for the rightist dictators friendly to the United States. As the Turkish Ambassador recently said in Washington: "Americans love their enemies and despise their friends."

Every believer in the sacred principles of the U.S. Constitution, its Bill of Rights and what used to be a government of laws and not of personalities would do well to study the strange pattern of the Perez Jimenez case.

#### BACKGROUND

Who: Gen. Marcos Perez Jimenez, President of Venezuela, 1952-58, now behind the bars of Dade County Jail.

Age: Forty-eight.

Family: The former Venezuelan President lived at 4609 Pine Tree Drive, Miami Beach, Fla., with his wife, the former Flor Chabaud, and four daughters: Margot, 17; Florangel, 14; Maria Sol, 10; and Flo de Maria, 6.

"It is my hope and desire that the U.S. Government will continue to allow me to live peacefully and quietly here with my family, as I have done the last 3 years, in order that my daughters may continue their American education, and that my wife and I may be a part of this community," said Gen. Perez Jimenez.

Church: The entire family regularly attends St. Patrick's Catholic Church, Miami Beach.

Friendship with the United States: Gen. Perez Jimenez, was one of the United States of America's staunchest supporters in this hemisphere.

In 1954 he was awarded the highest rank of the Legion of Merit by the United States for "his sound foreign-investment policies," and his government was cited by the late Secretary of State Dulles as "an example to other countries in Latin America."

Under his administration, American companies and individuals found Venezuela an ideal business climate for investment and operation. According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, those investments were drastically cut back in 1957 after Romulo Betancourt came into power. The country went from a policy of encouragement to one of discouragement where essential foreign investment was concerned.

Anti-Communist record: Not only was communism outlawed under the administration of Perez Jimenez, but members and sympathizers left Venezuela and their activities were practically nonexistent. The general severed relations with Russia and other satellite countries.

During this period the Action Democratica and Communist parties entered into a coalition to overthrow the anti-Communist Perez Jimenez government.

It is interesting to note that the Communist Party had been officially recognized during the years 1945-48 after Betancourt headed a seven-man ruling junta. With Betancourt's return to head of the government in 1958, communism again became legal in Venezuela and is flourishing there right now. The Encyclopedia Britannica reports that the number of Communists in Venezuela jumped from 20,000 in 1957 to 35,000 in 1959 and to 40,000 in 1960.

Status in the United States: Perez Jimenez entered the United States with a valid visitor's visa. Subsequent events in Venezuela made it impossible for him to return to that country. Consequently, he overstayed his temporary visa. Deportation proceedings were instituted and then deferred pending action on his application for permanent residence in the United States.

Perez Jimenez also applied for stay of deportation in formal proceedings provided by law on the ground that he would be subject to political persecution if deported to Venezuela. All immigration proceedings have been deferred pending outcome of the extradition matter. The Immigration Service had never required that the general be placed under bond, nor were his actions substantially restricted.

Attempts to extradite: General Perez Jimenez and his family came to the United States in 1958; thereafter sought political asylum. The general remained unmolested until August 25, of that year when extradition proceedings were formally instituted by the Betancourt regime. It is ironic that while the country seeks the return of Perez Jimenez, his wife and children are political exiles and are not permitted to return to Venezuela. It is also ironic that during Perez Jimenez's regime his government prepared for the extradition of Romulo Betancourt as a result of an assassination attempt upon the general's life; Perez Jimenez halted the proceedings to avoid involving the United States in his country's internal politics.

The Venezuelan Government has charged Perez Jimenez with complicity in the alleged murder of four persons and alleged misappropriation of funds. Upon completion of extradition proceedings in June 1961, U.S. District Judge George W. Whitehurst found that Perez Jimenez had no connection with the alleged murders but found probable cause as to the alleged financial charges. Evidence in the proceedings has been forwarded to the U.S. State Department. A petition for writ of habeas corpus was filed by counsel for Perez Jimenez which was predicated upon, among other things, a statement by Judge Whitehurst that he had in fact not read the evidence in the financial charges.

Appeal to U.S. court of appeals: The habeas corpus petition was denied on August 23d by U.S. District Judge William A. McRae Jr. An appeal was made. A \$100,000 bond was posted by the general.

The general, in a recent press conference, announced his intent to use every legal remedy at his disposal to remain in the United States.

Military career: Perez Jimenez graduated from military school in Caracas in 1933 as the most prominent student during 3 years of studies. He was given the rank of sub-lieutenant on July 5, 1933; entered the artillery division. He was then made professor of ballistics, professor of armaments, and professor of military information at the military institute and served at the school as staff officer until 1939. He went to Peru and continued his military studies; received his diploma as an officer of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He has received decorations from Venezuela, Guatemala, Ecuador, Bolivia, Argentina, and the United States.



1963

Political career: Following the 1945 revolution which deposed President Medina Angarita, Perez Jimenez launched his political career by opposing the seven-man junta headed by Romulo Betancourt. He continued to oppose the Gallegos regime of 1947, and the Leftist Accion Democratica. In 1948, when the Accion Democratica government was forced to retire, he became Defense Minister and a member of the military junta that ruled the country and which later became the Independent Electoral Front. In December of 1952 he became Provisional President of Venezuela; was elected Constitutional President in 1953. He held office until January 1958, when the Government was overthrown by a coalition opposition which included Accion Democratica and the Communist party.

Prosperity under his administration: Venezuela experienced astonishing material progress under the Perez Jimenez regime; reported a surplus in the national budget in 1954 of \$64 million. Petroleum production in that year was at a high of 2,112,000 barrels of oil per day. Fifty-seven percent of the national income was used to build highways, housing projects for workers, schools and hospitals. The Venezuelan Treasury at Perez Jimenez' resignation contained \$750 million.

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica: "The Perez Jimenez regime concentrated on the development of cities, stimulating the growth of an urban middle class \* \* \* during this period the Nation boasted the highest per capita income among the Central and South American countries."

According to the New York Times: Perez Jimenez was "a man with a mission" who had "dedicated himself to make Venezuela, a tropical underdeveloped country of 6 million inhabitants, the economic and social center of Latin America."

According to Life magazine: The economy under Perez Jimenez "enabled many Venezuelan workers, whose average wages have doubled in 10 years, to replace their rope-soled sandals with shoes, buy canned goods in the supermarkets and satisfy a craving for chicken and ice cream."

According to Collier's encyclopedia: "The spectacular economic boom continued unabated. After earmarking an additional \$23 million for public works in 1957, the richest country in Latin America looked around for impressive projects on an international scale. The Government pledged money at the United Nations for the proposed Special U.N. Fund for Economic Development \* \* \* It gave credit to Paraguay estimated at \$30 million and another \$15 million loan for development went to Ecuador."

According to the National City Bank of New York: Venezuela was in sound financial condition, and it distributed to its depositors a report that recommended the country for foreign investments.

According to the Book of Knowledge: "Venezuela (under Perez Jimenez) was never more prosperous. It has new iron mines, manufacturing, a steel mill, oil refinery, new railroads, highways, and ports. The Government enjoys more than a billion dollars a year in revenue from the oil industry alone. This wealth has permitted a spectacular public works program."

#### PUBLIC WORKS

According to Collier's Encyclopedia: "The multimillion-dollar income from the foreign petroleum companies completely transformed Caracas and other cities with the largest program of public works ever undertaken anywhere in Latin America. Old buildings were torn down by the hundreds to make way for wide avenues and skyscrapers. Hillside slums were being cleared away and occupants were moving into modern apart-

ments bought on easy terms. Superhighways were carved through the mountains to connect seaports with interior industrial cities. In 10 years, Venezuela quadrupled its highway mileage and had more good roads than Brazil, a country nearly 10 times as large."

Because slums were created by the sudden influx of agricultural workers to the industries in the cities, "the Government organized Banco Obrero, built 10 low-rental apartment houses in 1954 and transferred 30,000 families from shacks into new quarters. Construction was started in 1955 for about 30 more blocks to accommodate 15,000 more people.

According to the Book of Knowledge: "In April 1953, Venezuela adopted a new constitution \* \* \* 2 days later, Marcos Perez Jimenez was elected President. He launched a program of countrywide improvements. In the 1950's, for instance, Venezuela invested hundreds of millions of dollars in public projects such as housing, waterworks, schools, highways, harbor improvements, churches, buildings, and agriculture. Income from petroleum furnished the money for almost all of the projects. Huge housing projects have changed the living habits of thousands of people in the northern highlands. Many people have moved from tiny shacks into comfortable Government-built apartment buildings."

Venezuela encouraged immigration, and more than 340,000 immigrants came from Italy, Spain, Portugal, France, and Austria.

Relations with Betancourt: Shortly after Perez Jimenez assumed the Venezuelan presidency, former President Romulo Betancourt started an 8-week tour of South America, making protests and charges against the new regime. Simultaneously, the Accion Democratica and Communist Parties commenced agitation, and this resulted in decrees that outlawed both and made their political activities illegal. The two parties had fomented strikes in the oil industry with a view to crippling it and creating economic crisis. The strikes were accompanied by acts of sabotage and violence on a nationwide basis. Colonel Delgado Chalbaud had been killed in ambush in 1950; there were four attempts on the life of Perez Jimenez in the period from 1952 to 1954.

#### THE EXTRADITION CASE OF MARCOS PEREZ JIMENEZ BACKGROUND

Mr. Marcos Perez Jimenez served as President of Venezuela from 1952 to 1958.

He fled from Venezuela to the Dominican Republic early in 1958 when his government was overthrown. He applied for admission to the United States on March 28, 1958, as a visitor. He entered the United States in a parole status pending determination of his eligibility for admission. On January 7, 1959, he was admitted to the United States as a visitor until February 15, 1959, and that visit was extended to March 13, 1959. Further requests for extension were denied and, when he failed to leave the United States within a reasonable time after expiration of his lawful stay, deportation proceedings were instituted against him. After full hearings, Mr. Perez Jimenez was ordered deported and that determination by the Immigration and Naturalization Service was affirmed on appeal by the Board of Immigration Appeals on September 8, 1959.

#### EXTRADITION REQUEST

While the deportation proceedings were pending before the Board of Immigration Appeals, the Government of Venezuela, on August 25, 1959, filed a formal complaint in extradition under the United States-Venezuela Extradition Treaty of 1922 and section 3184, title 18, United States Code, seeking the return for prosecution of Mr. Perez Jimenez for alleged complicity in 4 homicides and for approximately 15 financial crimes such as embezzlement and fraud by which he allegedly obtained in excess of \$13 million. He was arrested at Miami pursuant to a warrant issued by the U.S. district court at Miami and was immediately released on bond.

Proceedings in U.S. Courts

The extradition hearing before a U.S. district judge sitting as an extradition magistrate extended over a period of almost 2 years and resulted on June 16, 1961, in the determination by the extradition magistrate that probable cause of Mr. Perez Jimenez' guilt of the financial crimes had been established but that his responsibility for or complicity in the homicides had not been shown. Pursuant to section 3184, title 18, United States Code, the extradition magistrate certified his finding and the record of the extradition hearing to the Secretary of State and ordered the commitment to jail of Mr. Perez Jimenez. He was immediately released on bond pending a decision on his petition for habeas corpus challenging the finding of the extradition magistrate.

Hearings on the habeas corpus petition were heard before a U.S. district judge on August 23 and 24, 1961. At the conclusion of the hearings the district judge found that the extradition proceedings had been conducted in accordance with law, that due process had been accorded Mr. Perez Jimenez, that the evidence presented showed probable cause to believe Mr. Perez Jimenez committed the financial crimes charged, that the crimes charged were crimes enumerated in the treaty between Venezuela and the United States which, had they been committed in this country, would be offenses against our laws and that the offenses were not political in character and thus not exempt from extradition. Accordingly, the petition for habeas corpus was dismissed. Mr. Perez Jimenez was again released under bond pending further order of the court.

Appeal was taken by Mr. Perez Jimenez to the U.S. court of appeals. In a lengthy opinion released on December 12, 1962, the court of appeals affirmed the district court's judgment. Immediately upon such affirmation and on the same day that the decision was announced, the district court, on its own motion, entered an order revoking the bond under which Mr. Perez Jimenez was at liberty and he was taken into custody. No doubt the action of the court was based, in part, on the consideration that his continued liberty on bond would enable him to flee which might result in this Government being unable to fulfill its treaty obligations should the final decision in the case be that extradition should be granted.

#### BAIL

The laws of the United States make no provision for bail in an international extradition case. The Supreme Court of the United States has stated that a court's discretion to grant bail in such cases should be exercised only in unusual and extraordinary circumstances prior to the holding of the extradition hearing and that allowance of bail after a finding of probable cause is inconsistent with the extradition laws of the United States. Nevertheless, Mr. Perez Jimenez was at liberty on bail not only before but after the extradition magistrate found that a proper case for extradition had been made out under the treaty and U.S. law and remained at liberty on bail until first the U.S. district court and then the U.S. court of appeals, on habeas corpus proceedings, had reviewed the case and rendered their decisions which, in effect, affirmed the finding of the extradition magistrate.

#### POLITICAL ASYLUM

The admission into the United States and the continued presence in the United States

February 25

of aliens is governed by the laws of the United States, principally the Immigration and Nationality Act. These laws contain no provision according an individual a right to remain in this country because he claims "political asylum." Whether a person in this country is subject to extradition to a foreign country where he is accused of crime is unrelated to his status under the immigration laws or his status as an alleged "political asylee" or whether he has committed a crime in this country but is dependent upon the application of the extradition treaties and related laws of the United States.

#### EXTRADITION TREATIES AND LAWS

In the extradition treaties the countries agree to surrender, on a reciprocal basis, persons found in one country who are charged in the other country with any of the crimes enumerated in the treaty. These treaties and laws prescribe the procedure which must be followed and the requirements which must be met to obtain the extradition of an alleged fugitive from justice. Under these treaties and U.S. laws the alleged fugitive, whether alien or U.S. citizen, has the opportunity to resist extradition in the courts to the full extent of the law with, in accordance with traditional standards of American justice, the assurance of equal treatment under the law. Among the issues the alleged fugitive may raise in opposition to the request for his extradition is that the offenses charged are political in character and thus not a proper basis for extradition. This was among the issues raised by Mr. Perez Jimenez at the extradition hearing and in the habeas corpus proceedings. The courts found against Mr. Perez Jimenez.

Under the laws of the United States the extradition of an alleged fugitive may be granted only for those offenses for which the extradition magistrate has found probable guilt has been shown. Under the extradition treaties of the United States, including the United States-Venezuela Treaty, a person extradited may be tried only for those offenses for which extradition has been granted. In addition, like most extradition treaties of the United States, the United States-Venezuela Treaty prohibits the punishment for political offenses of persons extradited under the treaty. In the case of Mr. Perez Jimenez, he can be extradited and tried in Venezuela only for the financial crimes for it was only with respect to these crimes that the extradition magistrate, the U.S. district court and the U.S. court of appeals found that the probable guilt of Mr. Perez Jimenez had been shown.

#### DECISION ON EXTRADITION

Mr. Perez Jimenez may petition the U.S. Supreme Court for review of the decision of the court of appeals. In the event that the final decision of the courts is that extradition is warranted under the laws and the treaty, the determination as to whether Mr. Perez Jimenez' extradition is required under the United States-Venezuelan Treaty will rest with the Secretary of State. In making that determination careful consideration will be given to every aspect of the case.

#### MR. PEREZ JIMENEZ' ANTICOMMUNIST POSITION

It has been noted that many of the individuals expressing sympathy or support for Mr. Perez Jimenez have pictured him as a staunch anti-Communist. From the standpoint of objectivity, it should be noted as well that Mr. Perez Jimenez, while President of Venezuela from 1952 to 1958, headed one of the most brutally repressive and corrupt dictatorships in recent Latin American history.

While the record clearly shows that Mr. Perez Jimenez' government undertook action against many leaders of the Venezuelan

Communist Party, it was even more severe in its harassment of democratic opposition groups. Moreover, there were indications in the final years of the Perez Jimenez dictatorship that it was coddling Communists in organized labor, the press, and in education. It apparently did this to make of them a counterfoil to the dominance of democratic opposition political groups in those key fields whom it considered a greater threat to itself than it did the Communists.

As a result of infiltration during the Perez Jimenez dictatorship, which became apparent after the overthrow of that regime in January 1958, the Communist Party of Venezuela emerged more strongly entrenched in labor, journalism, and education than ever before.

Since 1959, under a representative government, democratic political groups have managed to restore their position of dominance in labor, journalism, and education and greatly reduce Communist strength in these fields.

#### POLITICAL COMPLEXION OF THE VENEZUELAN GOVERNMENT

It has also been noted that many of the persons expressing sympathy for Mr. Perez Jimenez have done so in apparent belief that the present Government of Venezuela is Communist and pro-Communist and seeks to have him extradited to wreak its vengeance on him for his purported anticommunism. The similarity of their allegations suggests that they may be responding to solicitations from an organization or organizations conducting a campaign to discredit the Government of Venezuela and its President, Romulo Betancourt. Their allegations about the present Venezuelan Government are not supported by the facts and are at considerable variance with accurate information which has reached the Department of State from numerous reliable and competent close observers of Venezuela for many years.

The present Venezuelan Government is a coalition of the Democratic Action (AD) Party of President Betancourt, the Social Christian (Christian Democratic or Catholic) COPEI Party and political independents who are among the democratic leaders of the professional and business community.

The former Communist affiliation of President Betancourt during the beginning of his political career in the early 1930's has been common knowledge for many years. However, it is equally well known that he severed his connections with communism more than a quarter of a century ago, subsequently organized his own political movement, the AD Party, and formulated a political program based on democratic concepts of social reform related to the unique character of Venezuela's national problems.

The AD Party in its formative years was influenced by marxist ideas and some of its leaders have been avowed radical Marxists of the extreme left. However, the leftwing extremist leadership has been expelled from the party or has bolted from it. As presently constituted, the AD, under President Betancourt's leadership, is a nationalistic mixture of moderate social democrat and liberal. It advocates political, social, and economic changes through representative democratic means and does not seek to abolish the free enterprise system or private property. It is a "polyclass" party which stands for basic reforms by constitutional means which permit the participation of all democratic groups in the political process. It does not advocate revolution through class struggle.

Since its founding 23 years ago, the AD party under Mr. Betancourt has been a bitter political adversary of the Venezuelan Communists and a target of international Communist attack. Mr. Betancourt's firm stand against communism in general and particularly against its most recent manifestation

in this hemisphere, as represented by Fidel Castro, has been clearly and forcefully demonstrated many times during his Presidency.

Mr. Betancourt's government has been subjected to severe and continuing attacks by the Communist Party of Venezuela and an allied left-extremist group which had been expelled from the AD Party. Since late 1961 the Communist Party and its ally, the Movement of the Revolutionary Left, have embarked on an all-out campaign of terrorism, sabotage, crime, and guerrilla warfare to overthrow the Venezuelan Government.

As a result, the Venezuelan Government in May 1962 banned the activities of these two subversive, conspiratorial groups. More recently, the Government petitioned the Supreme Court to declare them illegal on the basis of evidence which it has supplied; and has undertaken increasingly severe and energetic security measures to counter Communist insurgency.

During the recent Cuban crisis, the Venezuelan Government strongly supported the U.S. position and contributed two warships to the naval quarantine of Cuba. In reprisal, Venezuelan Communists severely sabotaged some of the petroleum installations which are Venezuela's economic mainstay. The Venezuelan Government brought this Communist-directed sabotage, on behalf of the Communist Cuban regime, to the attention of the Organization of American States.

Indicative of the opinion of the resident U.S. citizen in Venezuela (about 30,000 in number), the English language Daily Journal of Caracas, Venezuela, whose publishers include several leaders of the U.S. community, carried the following editorial on November 7, 1962, which stated in part:

"North Americans all over the world can expect, these days, to be in the front line, and should not be surprised if Fidelistas and Communists attack them. Their answer should be compounded of composure and commonsense and appreciation of the fact that the vast majority of Venezuelans are with them.

"They can also remember that the President of Venezuela has said that attacks on American companies are attacks on the economy of Venezuela, no more and no less.

"North Americans have good reason to hold their heads high. Their country has been the symbol of the fight against tyranny. And Venezuela has joined it in that fight."

The Communist Cuban regime has been carrying on a propaganda campaign against the Venezuelan Government, and particularly against President Betancourt, that is exceeded in its ferocity and provocation only by the Castro Government's vilification of the United States. The Communist Cuban regime has clearly sided with the terrorist insurrection of the Venezuelan Communists.

A recent communique of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Venezuela stated that "the principal enemy of the Venezuelan people today is the government of Betancourt, through which U.S. imperialism and its allies, the local privileged classes, effect their rule. The plenary session of the central committee calls for joint action with all opposition groups against Betancourt." This theme is being echoed by the propaganda organs of international communism.

#### PRESIDENT BETANCOURT'S VISIT TO THE UNITED STATES

Venezuela was the first Latin American country which President Kennedy visited after his inauguration. He went there in December 1961, as a guest of President Betancourt to dramatize the cooperative effort being made by the United States, Venezuela, and the other Latin American countries to accelerate their economic and social development under the Alliance for Progress. The President's trip demonstrated the intense concern of the United States for the

1963

2813

programs of the Venezuelan Government aimed at improving the welfare of the greatest number of its people.

President Kennedy recently invited President Betancourt to visit the United States. President Betancourt has accepted this invitation and will come to Washington on February 19 and 20. This visit will enable President Kennedy to reciprocate the hospitality of the visiting chief of state of a country with which the United States has formed so many close and cordial ties. It will also afford the two Presidents an opportunity to exchange views on matters of mutual interest.

The Venezuelan Government of President Betancourt has demonstrated a firm desire to maintain the traditional friendly relations between our countries. Our friendly co-operation has furthered our mutual interest in the following objectives which are the antithesis of international communism: (a) extension of representative democracy, (b) accelerated economic, social, and cultural development within a framework of free institutions, and (c) inter-American cooperation in the defense of the security of this hemisphere against aggression or subversion.

The Government of Venezuela, under President Betancourt, has demonstrated its active interest in assuring economic and social progress with political stability and with freedom. It apparently is making strong efforts to meet the needs of the Venezuelan people and to strengthen democratic institutions. And it seems firmly determined to maintain the political independence of Venezuela. Such independence, of course, is contrary to the objectives of international communism.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I have three unanimous-consent requests. First, that the distinguished Speaker may extend his remarks at this point in the body of the RECORD on the subject of Estonian Independence Day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Estonia is one of the three Baltic countries in northeastern Europe, and the Estonians constitute one of three Baltic peoples. With an area of about 18,000 square miles, and a population of not much more than 1 million, Estonians have always figured as one of the smallest nationality groups in all of Europe. But to these gallant and gifted people mere size in numbers has not been of any real account. They have always faced their far more powerful enemies, invariably many times their size, with courage and determination, convinced that theirs has been a righteous and sacred cause. They have fought courageously against all their foes, and even in defeat they have made themselves glorious and great. In the course of their eventful history, when it was impossible for them to maintain their national independence, they refused to bow their heads to their conquerors and overlords. During the two centuries before 1918 they were subjected to cruel treatment at the hands of Russia's callous agents. They were fiercely persecuted for some of the beliefs they held and the ideas they advocated, but

these dauntless champions of freedom and liberty could neither be silenced nor subdued. They clung to their ideals until the time came for their freedom. In 1917 when the czarist regime in Russia was overthrown, they saw their chance, seized upon it, and proclaimed their national independence on February 24 of 1918.

Since then world-rocking events have brought about many revolutionary changes everywhere. But the disheartening change brought about in the first years of the last war ushered in a new tragedy to many peoples. Unfortunate Estonians could not defy their fate. Early in 1940 Estonia was invaded by the Red army, occupied, and soon it was made part of the Soviet Union. In the course of the war the Estonians exchanged their Communist overlords for Nazi invaders, but that did not change their lot; they suffered equally under both. Toward the end of the war the Communists returned with more force and unbridled fury, and there they remain to this day. They have turned once independent and free Estonia into a large prison camp where all Estonians work for their taskmasters in the Kremlin. They are completely cut off from the free world, and we really know little of their actual status. Without any personal and political freedom, under abominable conditions, they lead a miserable life. But they have not lost heart, and they still hope for their deliverance from misery and servitude, from Communist totalitarian tyranny. On this 45th anniversary celebration of their independence day we ardently hope and fervently pray for their freedom and independence.

#### COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

Mr. ALBERT. Second, Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during general debate on February 25, 26, 27, 28, and March 1, 4, and 5.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is going to be the business of the House on those days? Does the gentleman have any idea whether there will be important legislation before the House on those days?

Mr. ALBERT. There may well be important legislation on some of those days, but I would like to advise the gentleman the reason for this request, as I understand it, from the Committee on Banking and Currency is to do just exactly what the gentleman wants done and; that is, to process the committee part of legislation and get it to the floor so that we can proceed with the business of the House.

Mr. GROSS. Of course, we all want to proceed with the business of the House, but not at the expense of Members being in committees and not on the floor of the House when important legislation is being considered.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman recognizes that this permission for the committee to sit extends only to such time as the House is engaged in general debate and not while the House is considering legislation in Committee of the Whole on amendments under the 5-minute rule or during the consideration by the House of any other matter pertaining to the actual processing of bills and other legislative matters.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I will not object to this request but later when the legislative machinery starts to roll, the gentleman from Iowa will be constrained to object to projecting unanimous consent requests of this nature into the unknown future.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I understand from the press reports that the matter to be taken up by the Committee on Banking and Currency is this so-called mass transportation bill that is to cost a minimum of \$500 million to take care of some of the transportation problems of some of the large cities at the cost of all the taxpayers of the Nation. Is that the bill to be considered?

Mr. ALBERT. If the gentleman will yield, I am not prepared to advise specifically what legislation will be involved here, but like the gentleman, and like the party of the gentleman, we are all concerned with the problems of the city as we are concerned with the problems of other elements of our society.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Some of us are concerned just a little bit with the budget situation and the situation of the Federal Treasury too. There are some of us who may not be quite as inspired with the idea that we ought to pay for mass transportation of the great cities as some of the rest of you. I am just wondering if this is an attempt to speed up consideration of legislation of this type, and whether or not it should not follow the orderly procedure of handling legislation here in the House so that Members would have an opportunity to attend hearings and know exactly what is going on. Does the gentleman know?

Mr. ALBERT. I am not prepared to answer the specific question of the gentleman.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Then I will object, Mr. Speaker, at this time.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not press the other consent request?

Mr. ALBERT. I renew the request made on behalf of the gentleman from Texas, [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I object to the latter request until I know what the committee is going to take up and discuss during the time the House is in session on other important legislation.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. When that information is furnished me I will discuss the withdrawal of the objection.



2814

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

ADDITIONAL PROGRAM FOR WEEK  
OF FEBRUARY 25

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, I take this time to announce to the House that the several bills out of the Committee on Ways and Means which were scheduled for today are being put over until tomorrow at the request of the distinguished chairman of the committee. I may add that two of these bills will come at a later date, H.R. 2862 and House Resolution 57.

Mr. Speaker, I desire also to advise the House that the first order of business on Wednesday will be the supplemental appropriation bill, commodity credit, Public Law 480, and also that on Wednesday the Committee on House Administration will bring up several resolutions, including the following:

House Resolution 239, Agriculture.  
House Resolution 146, Armed Services.  
House Resolution 204, Banking and Currency; Housing.

House Resolution 202, District of Columbia.

House Resolution 243, Foreign Affairs.  
House Resolution 80, Government Operations.

House Resolution 165, House Administration.

House Resolution 135, Interior and Insular Affairs.

House Resolution 226, Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

House Resolution 35, and House Resolution 100, Judiciary.

House Resolution 30, Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

House Resolution 152, Post Office and Civil Service.

House Resolution 236, and House Resolution 237, Public Works.

House Resolution 177, Science and Astronautics.

House Resolution 222, Small Business.

House Resolution 249, Un-American Activities.

House Resolution 74, Veterans' Affairs.  
House Resolution 227, Ways and Means.

There may be some additional resolutions from this committee which will meet in executive session on Tuesday. If more are added they may be programmed for Wednesday and the balance of the week also.

I may advise, Mr. Speaker, that these resolutions may not necessarily be called up in the order in which I have announced them, and I would like also to advise the House again that any further program for the week will be announced later.

Mr. Speaker, I note the presence of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, and I suggest that he submit the request which I attempted to make earlier and to which the gentleman from Ohio objected.

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND  
CURRENCY

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency be allowed to sit during general debate in addition to the time already granted, on February 25, 26, 27, 28, and on March 1, 4, and 5.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I wonder what bills are coming up?

Mr. PATMAN. We have the Export-Import Bank hearings going on now. We will also take up mass transportation Wednesday.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Wednesday of this week?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. That will go over to the end of this period. This is just for afternoons.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. What length of time will the gentleman have on the mass transportation bill?

Mr. PATMAN. We will have probably a week of hearings.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that a statement we can depend on?

Mr. PATMAN. We will finish the hearings on March 5.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Yes. Will the chairman arrange for an opportunity to be given to those persons who oppose this proposition?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. This morning one came in and wanted to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This will not be a hearing in which the proponents alone will have the opportunity to be heard?

Mr. PATMAN. No. We have fair hearings in our committee, and we hear both sides. We give every witness an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. How much money is involved?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know about the terms of all the different bills. There are several bills. It is quite a sum.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I understand that the amount mentioned is \$500 million to start the program.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. But I think it is contemplated that only a small part will be available the first year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. For the first year. Then the total cost will run into million?

Mr. PATMAN. The \$500 million is the outside figure. Only about \$10 million will be taken up the first year. I would not like to be committed to that, however.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. It will run into the millions of dollars?

Mr. PATMAN. It will run into millions of dollars, yes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the chairman wants to have the hearing and will assure the House there will be at least 1 week of hearings, with an opportunity for opponents to be heard also, I have no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. I so assure the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas? There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE AND  
ASTRONAUTICS

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Science and Astronautics may be allowed to sit during general debate in the afternoon session of the House for the balance of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SPACE PROGRAM—ANYTHING  
GOES?

(Mr. SIKES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, news coverage in recent days, which states that NASA has failed to entice away from the Air Force two of its top space aces with hefty pay increases, fails to give a true picture of what is happening. There is another word for this. It is called pirating. NASA has unlimited funds and too little concern for cost. This action must be called disregard for the American taxpayer. Military space programs are, in the opinion of many, even more important than NASA's programs. Bidding by Government agencies against each other for personnel is a bad practice for all the Government. When that takes place, the only answer is for each agency or service to try to outbid the other and to do so each must constantly justify to Congress higher grades and bigger salaries. We, in the United States, seem to have gotten ourselves into a dangerous attitude over space efforts. Anything goes as long as it is for space. This is not conducive to sound accomplishment and it plays havoc with budget problems. Someone upstairs needs to talk to the space people about realism.

ESTONIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

(Mr. DERWINSKI (at the request of Mr. BELL) was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the 24th day of February, the Estonian Republic would have celebrated its 45th anniversary.

I use the term "would have celebrated" since obviously, the Estonian people now held in bondage by the Soviet Union are not free to celebrate the legitimate anniversary of their freedom. Certainly, they are no longer a free people but do look forward to the day when their legitimate desire for self-determination will once again produce a free and independent Estonia.

However, it is noteworthy that Estonian refugees from Soviet persecution scattered around the continents of the world continue to observe this anniversary.

# House of Representatives

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 25, 1963

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D.D., offered the following prayer:  
Psalm 112: 6: *The righteous shall be held in everlasting remembrance.*

Almighty God, we thank Thee for that great day in our national life when we are again united to commemorate the birth of George Washington, whom we reverently and affectionately call the "Father of his Country."

Our hearts expand with gratitude and pride as we think of his intrepid spirit of adventure, his fortitude in times of hardship, and his fidelity to the principles of righteousness and justice which inspired him to champion the cause of the oppressed colonists.

We rejoice that he bore witness to a lofty idealism when he urged his fellow men to keep alive within their breasts that little spark of celestial fire called "conscience."

Above all we are thankful for his humble and devout faith which sent him down upon his knees in prayer at Valley Forge in order that he might know how to march and keep in step with the eternal will and wisdom of God.

Grant that the memory of his life may strengthen and sustain the soul of our Republic and constrain us to labor in faith and faithfulness for the blessedness of all mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 21, 1963, was read and approved.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. McGown, one of its clerks, announced that the President of the Senate, pursuant to section 1(a) (1) of Public Law 87-586, had appointed Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. SMATHERS to be members of the St. Augustine Quadricentennial Commission.

## SUPPLEMENTAL FUNDS FOR PUBLIC LAW 480 AND COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION OPERATIONS

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order to consider on Wednesday, February 27, a special resolution and report from the Committee on Appropriations which will provide supplemental funds for Public Law 480 and Commodity Credit Corporation operations for the balance of the fiscal year 1963.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what was the date?

Mr. WHITTEN. Wednesday of this week, February 27.

Mr. GROSS. Is this an emergency situation?

Mr. WHITTEN. It is an emergency situation. The Corporation is just about out of funds, and unless these funds are made available they will have to notify the Nation that no more funds for the commodities now supported will be available unless action is taken in the next week or 10 days. What we are doing here is bringing forward from next year's budget request funds to enable them to operate at the present time and not have to stop all price supports. There has been talk about reducing price supports on certain classes of cotton. Then, in regard to corn, they have on hand about 400 million bushels which they could sell, but at the present time, to dump it on the domestic market would have a depressing effect on the market.

In effect it is bringing forward into this fiscal year some of the funds which were requested for the coming fiscal year so as not to have all of this chaos in regard to it.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield further, does this bill in any way deal with pending special privilege legislation relating to cotton?

Mr. WHITTEN. No; no, this is directed to the Commodity Credit Corporation in order for it to have funds with which to operate for the balance of this fiscal year.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I would like to ask a further question: Is not this advance or transfer of funds that would be due for price-support purposes for agricultural products in fiscal year 1964 to be used in this fiscal year 1963 because the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Freeman, found it impossible to make good on the very glorified promises he made the American people and the American farmers about a year ago as to how he was going to reduce the cost of farm price supports? Is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I would have to say that there are other factors involved.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is that one of the factors involved?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly the situation is not as good as I had hoped it would be, and as the gentleman from Ohio hopes, but in actuality the Congress last year reduced the budget request by some \$800 million, and that

is about \$300 million more than is being restored here.

There are a good many factors that enter into it. We tried to hold it down. However, unless we give them some relief, we will have chaos throughout the country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Is it not a fact that the Secretary of Agriculture certainly did not properly estimate his needs for price-support money last year, and did not inform the Congress properly; is not that correct?

Mr. WHITTEN. I will have to say this: that the Department and the Bureau of the Budget erred on the side of too much, because they requested \$800 million last year and the Congress approved. And, may I say the Congress approved the amount I recommended. We tried to hold it down. But the request was far more than we permitted. This restoration will leave them with \$300 million less than the Bureau of the Budget requested last year.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. But it is still more than the Secretary pledged the American people it would be, is it not?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly there are many places where I do not think it has worked out as many people hoped. As the gentleman from Ohio recalls, I did not vote for the farm bill because I did not see soundness of paying cash, when we had surplus commodities. I also differed in other respects.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the facts are that millions of farmers have a contract with Uncle Sam which Uncle Sam must honor. The only way Uncle Sam can keep his word and make that contract good in this instance is for Uncle Sam to pay the bill which he promised to pay; is not that right?

Mr. WHITTEN. Certainly, we have to honor the contracts. May I say in this situation as far as the Commodity Credit Corporation is concerned, on the one hand the law says they have mandatory obligations. They have to support prices as fixed by law. Then they have another statute which says if they do support them and they do not have the money, then they violate that law.

Mr. JENSEN. I am receiving letters from many farmers saying that Uncle Sam has not delivered the checks to them that were promised under contract.

Mr. WHITTEN. We will have to carry out those contracts.

Mr. JENSEN. It is an obligation, and if Uncle Sam makes a contract with 1 American or 1 million Americans, it is our duty as Representatives in the Con-

gress to see that Uncle Sam does keep his word.

Mr. WHITTEN. That is right. Under the conservation reserve the Government entered into a contract, and it is an obligation that must be honored.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

### OAS AWAITS U.S. LEADERSHIP BEFORE ACTING ON CUBA

(Mr. ROGERS of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, only yesterday on a national television network the Chairman of the Council of the Organization of American States, Dr. Gonzalo Facio, reiterated his plea for U.S. leadership before the OAS can act on the Cuban problem. The OAS leader said that the OAS can only play a role secondary to the United States in relations with Cuba.

In addition to these encouraging statements, the OAS President stated that growing dissatisfaction with the Cuban military and civilian establishment makes anti-Castro moves particularly timely. He recommended internal action as an adjunct to concerted action by the nations of this hemisphere.

As a further indication of OAS receptiveness for U.S. initiative, Dr. Facio stated that in his judgment the hemispheric organization would even go as far as supporting a total U.S. blockade of Castro's island, thus placing Cuba in solitary confinement in this hemisphere.

Mr. Speaker, in the more than 3 years of Castroism in Cuba, we have seen this island reinforced almost daily under our very noses. There have been heightening cries for action from the Congress and other areas of prominence such as the press throughout the Nation. However, this is the second time this year that the president of the international organization has called for solid U.S. initiative.

I reiterate my call that the United States close its seaports to ships calling in Cuba as a first act of U.S. leadership. After so doing, this Government should then turn to the OAS quickly, proposing that the hemispheric body adopt the following U.S. recommendations:

First. Close the seaports of this hemisphere to ships calling in Cuba.

Second. Close the airports of this hemisphere to airlines with flights into Cuba.

Third. Ban relay of telecommunications messages to and from Cuba.

Fourth. Impose a travel curb on movement of Castro agents and propaganda throughout Latin America.

Fifth. Freeze all Cuban Government funds now on deposit in Latin American financial institutions.

Mr. Speaker, Latin America awaits U.S. initiative while we engage in a debate of semantics as to whether or not Russian military strength in Cuba is offensive or defensive. One Soviet soldier in Cuba is one too many. Whenever

the question comes up of whether Soviet missiles, rockets, jet fighter planes, tanks, rifles, and troops in Cuba are offensive or defensive, we would do well to recall the incident of last week when the Cuban Mig's fired on the unarmed U.S. shrimp boat *Ala*. The sting of that incident is still with us.

Should such an attack happen again, "Remember the *Ala*" should be the signal for blistering U.S. retaliation.

### CHICAGO, FISK UNIVERSITY AND LEONTYNE PRICE

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the story of a great city, a great university and a great singer. It is a story in Americana that projects the true image of our beloved country. It was related, 92 years after its inception, by Mayor Richard J. Daley, of Chicago.

The occasion was Leontyne Price's triumphant appearance in the vast auditorium in McCormack Place before the largest and perhaps the most wildly and enthusiastically applauding audience in Chicago's musical history. Leontyne Price had come to sing at a benefit to raise money for Fisk University. The response was recordbreaking. It followed the pattern in the many foreign countries and in the American cities where a public admiration and adoration of Leontyne Price reflected the universal sentiment of millions. The needed money raised for Fisk University also was recordbreaking as the proceeds from a single concert.

But this was the climax of a story that started 92 years ago, a story told by Mayor Richard J. Daley as he spoke briefly at the concert, welcoming Leontyne Price. In 1871, the year of the great fire in Chicago, the Fisk Jubilee Singers sang their first concert. Every cent of their fee, \$50, they sent to the then Mayor Joseph Medill to help out the homeless, suffering people of the metropolis that fire had all but wiped out.

And when Leontyne Price came to the city that had been rebuilt from the ashes, came to raise money for Fisk University, that in the intervening years like Chicago had been growing and expanding and servicing mankind, Mayor Daley paid back the \$50 gift of the Fisk Jubilee Singers of 1871, with interest. This is Americana.

Mr. Speaker, by unanimous consent I am extending my remarks to include the following review of Leontyne Price's triumphant appearance in Chicago by Claudia Cassidy in the Chicago Tribune: LEONTYNE PRICE'S FISK BENEFIT LURES \$41,000 GROSS AND A DIVIDEND FROM MAYOR DALEY

(By Claudia Cassidy)

Leontyne Price came back with honey in the mouth and fire in the heart, an enticing combination. She enticed a capacity audience and a gross of \$41,000 to the Fisk University benefit in the big house in McCormack Place yesterday afternoon, when there also was a visit, a brief speech, and a dividend from Mayor Daley.

The mayor said that back in 1871 the Fisk

Jubilee Singers sang their first concert. It was in Chillicothe, Ohio, and their total, inclusive fee was \$50. Then they heard of the Chicago fire and they sent every penny of it to Mayor Joseph Medill, to help out. Mayor Daley returned the gift, with interest, but he did not say how much, and neither did Edward W. Beasley, who thanked him for the check. On inquiry, it turned out to be \$500.

No one had quite known in advance what even a singer of Miss Price's potency would make of a song recital in a theater seating 5,000. At least where I sat on the fifth row it worked out surprisingly well. The gray steel curtain had been lowered, the piano pushed out front, and a kind of "Aida" or "Cleopatra" effect set up by five tall pillars in muted fireglow, with discreet lighting for shadows. Except for occasional slight huskiness in the low voice—it blurred the Mozart trill—Miss Price was singing superbly, and the quality projected even when she spoke.

If you thought, as some did, that you never had heard her to better advantage, it was partly because in opera she so often sing dramatic soprano roles, while in recital she could cling to her true realm of the lyric or lirico spinto. It was also an advance in musicianship, in presence, in ease before a large audience, but primarily it was voice. This is one of the loveliest voices in the world, in its luster, its purity, its soaring excitement, its sudden depth of feeling, and the way it can wrap opera right around its little finger.

That last happened when she invaded Renata Tebaldi's domain for the two caressing arias from Cilea's "Adriana Lecouvreur"—for even poison caresses Adriana before it kills her. Here for just a second Miss Price turned into the tiger cat coaxed out when Hervert von Karajan conducts. Her Donna Anna was more stately than when she does the role with him, but no less beautiful.

Her program was rather a brave one for a benefit performance, Schubert, with "An die Leler," "Liebesbotschaft" and "Die Allmacht" outstanding; an interesting group of Poulenc songs programed before his death and sung in his memory and to do him honor; four Samuel Barber songs set to poems by James Joyce, "Nuvoletta" in particular done with a special and capricious skill.

At the back of the house for the spirituals, acoustics backfired. What had been David Garvey's dull piano sounded fresher, but you would not have recognized Miss Price.

### HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

(Mr. O'HARA of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute to revise and extend his remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of pleasure and of pride to all the Members of this body when one of our colleagues, regardless of the side of the aisle he occupies, is accorded editorial commendation all must regard as richly deserved.

ROMAN PUCINSKI was an Air Force pilot. He led his bomber group in the first B-29 bombing raid over Tokyo. In all he flew 48 combat missions over Japan. Now as a distinguished Member of the Congress he was called upon that wartime experience to render a service that well may result in the giving of greater safety to travel by air and the minimizing of the number of plane crashes.

I include in my remarks the editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 23, 1963, that tells the story and pays to the Honorable ROMAN C. PUCINSKI, a



The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The resolution will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 90) amending rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate relating to standing committees.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio has asked unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio yields to the Senator from South Dakota with the understanding that he will not lose his right to the floor.

#### UNITED NATIONS AID TO CUBA

Mr. LAUSCHE. Mr. President, there has been considerable discussion about the wisdom and justification of the United Nations, through its Special Fund, giving aid to Cuba. Within the last few days I heard a number of comments and read some articles contending that our Government, in objecting to the grant of aid out of the Special Fund to Cuba, was making a serious mistake. I do not agree with that view. In my judgment, the United Nations grant of aid to Cuba out of the Special Fund would perpetrate a direct affront upon the United States.

My reasons for making that statement are as follows: I recognize that the Special Fund set up in the United Nations is contemplated for use in helping distressed people around the world, keeping in mind that political and ideological leanings should not be considered. Recognizing fully that principle as being in force, I still am of the opinion that the Special Fund should not have been made available to Castro and his communistic government.

I direct the attention of the Senate to a bit of the statistical background of the United Nations Special Fund. It is a voluntary Fund created by the contributions of various nations of the world. From 1959, the date of the establishment of the Fund, down to 1963, the sum of \$251 million has been expended from the Special Fund of the United Nations. Of that \$251 million, the U.S. Government put up \$100,400,000, or 40 percent of the amount.

In the same period all of the Communist nations of the world, including Yugoslavia, pledged the total sum of \$8,228,-

225. Red Russia pledged and put up \$5 million. We pledged and put up \$100 million. The other Communist nations, consisting of Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Mongolia, Rumania, Ukraine, Cuba, and Yugoslavia put up \$8,228,225.

I repeat that the total contributed by all the Communist countries to the special fund was \$8,228,225. Our government alone contributed \$100,400,000.

Cuba is a member of the United Nations. It pledged \$55,000 for the special fund, as follows: \$5,000 in 1960, nothing in 1961, \$25,000 in 1962, and \$25,000 in 1963, making a total of \$55,000.

Of the \$55,000 pledged, Cuba has not paid 1 penny. It has paid not 1 penny of its obligation to finance the operations in the Gaza strip and in the Congo. It is in arrears in the payment of its normal assessments for the management of the United Nations. As of this date Cuba is in arrears \$496,000 of its obligations to the United Nations. It has paid practically nothing.

Two or three months ago Cuba paid \$160,000 of its arrearage in the special operating assessments because it wanted to avoid being expelled.

Let us keep in mind the picture. Cuba is in arrears \$496,000, and has paid not 1 penny of its pledges for the special fund and not 1 penny for its obligations in maintaining the operations of the United Nations in the Congo and in the Gaza strip. Cuba wants the benefit of the work of the United Nations and of the funds of the United Nations but does not wish to bear its obligations.

Let us see what is contemplated by way of aid to Cuba. The item which is immediately in controversy is a \$1,157,000 grant out of the special fund to help the Cuban Communist government solve its agricultural problems. There have also been pledged to the Government of Cuba two other sums. In the 1961-62 financial period, Cuba is programed to receive \$445,883 covering 10 projects to be carried out in Cuba by the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization; the International Labor Organization; the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization; and the World Health Organization. In addition to the sums I have already mentioned—\$1,157,000 and the last sum of \$445,883—there is programed an additional sum of \$405,780. The program to be covered by this third sum envisages \$69,000 for an ILO social security project in Cuba, \$160,000 for an FAO fisheries project, \$54,000 for a UNESCO marine biological project, \$13,500 for a UNESCO education project, \$17,280 for an ICAO civil aviation project, and \$152,000 for the WHO public health work.

As closely as I have been able to figure out, since Castro became the chief of Cuba and since the Communists have taken over, Cuba has paid into the United Nations \$160,000 and is in arrears in the sum of \$496,000, while Cuba is to receive the sum of \$2.2 million. With due respect to some who are trying to justify this action on the part of the United Nations, I must say that what is being done does not reconcile

itself with my concept of fairness and decency either to the people of the United States or to the people of the world.

Castro and his Communist government want all of the benefits which can be provided by the United Nations without being willing to bear any of the obligations.

Our Government has put up \$100 million, while all of the Communist governments of the world, in 5 years, as I have indicated, have pledged \$8,228,000, and, as I have said, Castro is in arrears \$496,000.

One can recognize the charter provisions that there should be no decision made on the basis of ideology and politics, but there were grounds to make a decision that Cuba was in arrears, was flouting its responsibilities to the United Nations, and therefore was not entitled to the charity and beneficence of the citizens of the United States.

Finally, this is an affront and an insult to every taxpayer of the United States. In effect, it states to the U.S. citizen, "You give. We will not hold others even morally responsible, but you must continue with your charity and observe your high ethical principles, regardless of the insults perpetrated upon you."

Mr. JOHNSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LAUSCHE. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I am very much interested in what the Senator from Ohio is saying and the point he is making at this particular time. I presume the Senator would be in favor of Cuba and the other nations which are in arrears either paying up or getting out.

Mr. LAUSCHE. I want them to make an honest effort to pay their obligations and pledges; not to adopt the position that they shall give nothing and take everything.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator thoroughly. I think they ought to be given a certain time limit in the near future to pay up. Then, of course, they would be in good standing.

Mr. LAUSCHE. The United Nations now has a provision that if a Nation is in arrears for 2 years with respect to a certain category of obligations it must step out, and that is the only reason why the Communist government of Cuba paid the sum of \$160,000 recently, while remaining in debt and in arrearage in the sum of \$496,000.

Mr. JOHNSTON. Would not the Senator be in favor of nations in arrears not being allowed to receive money out of any United Nations fund until they pay up?

Mr. LAUSCHE. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. JOHNSTON. I agree with the Senator emphatically.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

### MEDICAL CARE AND WYOMING'S LEGISLATURE

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. President, in regard to the upcoming debate on a federally controlled program of medical care for the Nation's aged, I am proud to report an action by Wyoming's distinguished governor, Clifford Hansen, and the 1963 State legislature, in providing an enabling act for the Kerr-Mills medical care law.

This enabling act was signed into law by Governor Hansen February 14. It had cleared Wyoming's Senate without a dissenting vote, and was passed by the house of representatives with a comfortable 39 to 16 margin.

The Equality State's Kerr-Mills law will provide \$570,000 in State funds which will be matched by Federal funds for the first 2 years of the program.

Unlike the proposal backed by the administration, this Wyoming approved Kerr-Mills program will not be under tight or arbitrary Federal control.

It is a voluntary program in which no aged person is forced to participate. I consider the action of Wyoming's Legislature in implementing the Kerr-Mills approach to medical care for its senior citizens an outstanding example of what a State can do to handle its own medical problems with Government assistance but without Government excesses or control.

In the context of this subject, I request unanimous consent to have published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, with this statement, an editorial by the noted columnist David Lawrence, who with great candor and fairness points out the pitfalls of a federally dominated, mandatory medical care program.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### FEDERAL HAND IN MEDICAL CARE—ADMINISTRATION PLAN CRITICIZED AS LIKELY TO INTENSIFY SHORTAGE OF DOCTORS

(By David Lawrence)

It's going to be harder to get a doctor when you are sick, harder to get into a hospital, and harder to take care of the young as well as the old who become ill in the future—if the Federal Government intervenes in the field of medical care as just recommended to Congress by President Kennedy.

Time was when, if you were sick, you could get a doctor to come to your home. Today most patients have to go to the doctor's office except when gravely ill.

There simply aren't enough doctors now. This is primarily because medical aid is covered in part by private insurance plans that make it less costly. Persons who used to take care of minor ailments themselves often seek medical aid nowadays. The insurance idea, itself, is a good one. But until the shortage of doctors produced by the existing plans is overcome, the proposed intervention by the Federal Government with free medical care for certain age groups will only intensify the problem for almost everybody. Elderly persons require individual care and continuous observation, but if there is a shortage of physicians, these patients will be neglected, no matter how much of the bill the Government is willing to pay.

It's good politics, of course, for any President to champion social-welfare legislation, but free medical attention for millions of citizens will constitute in the field of welfare benefits the biggest single expense imposed on all the people.

Taxes are to be raised to finance the medical plan proposed by the President. Not only will everybody's social security rates go up, but the tax will be imposed on the first \$5,200 of salary instead of the current figure of \$4,800 a year. The purpose, of course, is to collect about \$10 billion more over the next 5 years. Just what this does to the administration program for a "tax cut" is not readily calculated, but it is another example of how the much-talked-about "tax cut" is rapidly turning into a tax rise.

With the objective of the President's plan—to provide medical care for the aged—there will be little dissent. But the question really is whether those families which can afford to take care of their own aged members shall be required to pay taxes to support a plan in which their own relatives—though able to afford the medical care—would get it at Government expense.

The medical care agitation will, moreover, raise false hopes. The proposed plan doesn't cover medical treatment but mostly the charges for hospitalization and related services. The political value, however, of proclaiming "medical care for the aged" will continue to be there, and it's politics that's really back of the whole crusade.

The vast majority of doctors are vehemently opposed to the new plan. They feel it will demoralize the whole system of medical care in America, and they ought to know. They constitute a dedicated profession. They are on call in serious cases at the hospitals or at private homes day and night. They must be precise in their findings, because errors can be fatal.

The members of the profession are men and women who know medical conditions in this country and are familiar also with what "socialized medicine has meant in various other countries. They fear that the new plan some day will result in "socialized medicine"—a scheme in which the Government runs the medical-care program, pays the fees of doctors and standardizes their incomes. The administration denies that its plan will ever bring "socialized medicine," but the doctors know that, if the medical profession is overwhelmed with cases due to the free service programs provided by the Government, the demand on the time of all doctors will be so great that the Government will have to step in to try to bring order out of the chaos that will ensue.

Nobody objects to better medical care for the aged, as well as for everybody else, but there are serious differences of opinion as to whether those who seek to make political capital of the issue will produce frustration in the medical profession and a lowering of the high standards of medical care which have long prevailed in America.

### THE WAR IN SOUTH VIETNAM

Mrs. SMITH. Mr. President, the war in South Vietnam is very remote to most of us and its meaning is limited to what we read in the newspapers or hear about it on television and radio. I have been fortunate enough to be there and thus to realize some of the conditions there. But none of us here in the U.S. Senate really know what our servicemen are going through there—and I doubt if we really have a true appreciation of what they are doing.

Lt. Douglas Emery, a graduate of the University of Maine, and the son of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Emery, of Hartland,

Maine, is one of our servicemen fighting in South Vietnam.

He has written one of the most unforgettable letters I have ever read. It is a very moving letter about the deep appreciation that the free people of Vietnam have of our aid to them.

I ask unanimous consent that his letter, and an article in the Waterville, Maine, Morning Sentinel of January 31, 1963, be placed in the body of the RECORD at this point—and I urge all Members to read it.

There being no objection, the article and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Waterville (Maine) Morning Sentinel, Jan. 31, 1963]

#### HARTLAND LIEUTENANT WRITES HOME OF LIFE IN VIETNAM SERVICE

The following letter was received from Lt. Douglas Emery, son of Mr. and Mrs. Floyd Emery, of Hartland.

Lieutenant Emery graduated from the University of Maine in June 1959 when he was commissioned second lieutenant. In November he went to Fort Benning, Ga., for training and in February 1960 he arrived at Fort Dix, N.J. While at Fort Dix, N.J., he received his commission as first lieutenant, and served as company commander until May 1962.

He left for Fort Bragg, N.C., in June for a 4-week training in guerrilla warfare, and then went to Monterey, Calif., to a language school for 5 weeks' training before going to South Vietnam.

From Saigon he went to the northern part of South Vietnam to Quang Tri where the headquarters were located. From there he went to Tabat, an outpost, and then to Ashau, about 20 miles away, which was another outpost. He expects to return to Tabat soon.

The rainy weather makes it necessary to wait for the landing of a plane to pick up the mail where he is located. Also the delivery of mail, which is dropped from a helicopter, brings much delayed correspondence, since in January of this year he has just received some of his Christmas mail.

Lieutenant Emery's period of service in Vietnam is 1 year, and he arrived there about September 1, 1962.

The letter:

"THANKSGIVING 1962.

"DEAREST MUM AND DAD: It's Thanksgiving night of 1962, approximately 8 p.m.—you will be just getting up to prepare for Thanksgiving Day. I have a very beautiful, heart-warming story to tell you, despite all the ironies involved. Please excuse my messy writing, as I can hardly hold my eyes open.

"This afternoon we returned from a 2-day patrol during which we had a pretty rough time. We lived on cold boiled rice balls, and it poured continuously by the buckets; we were getting very discouraged, cold, wet, and hungry.

"My cigarettes were ruined when we swam two rivers, and I shared the bamboo pipe of the fellow whom I mentioned in my last letter. The leeches were clamping onto us by the dozens, and we had to stop often to pull them off each other. We were all bleeding from at least 25 little holes caused by the leeches.

"On our way back, we were ambushed by the Viet Cong. After this deal we continued back with the rifles, grenades, papers, letters, etc., of the enemy dead (whom we buried), and carrying our wounded (and dead).

"When we got back to base, I undressed from my drenched clothing, pulled the remaining leeches off, and wrapped in a blanket, which was the only dry thing around. I lit a dry cigarette, feeling damn sick,